

Johannine Sectarianism
in Perspective

Supplements
to
Novum Testamentum

Executive Editors

M.M. Mitchell

Chicago

D.P. Moessner

Dubuque

Editorial Board

C.K. BARRETT, Durham—P. BORGES, Trondheim

J.K. ELLIOTT, Leeds—C.R. HOLLADAY, Atlanta

H.W. HOLLANDER, Leiden—H.J. DE JONGE, Leiden

A.J. MALHERBE, New Haven—M.J.J. MENKEN, Utrecht

J. SMIT SIBINGA, Amsterdam

VOLUME 119

Johannine Sectarianism in Perspective

A Sociological, Historical, and Comparative
Analysis of Temple and Social Relationships
in the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran

by

Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth



BRILL
LEIDEN • BOSTON
2005

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fuglseth, Kåre.

Johannine sectarianism in perspective : a sociological, historical, and comparative analysis of temple and social relationships in the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran / by Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth.

p. cm. — (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, ISSN 0167-9732 ; v. 119)

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and indexes.

ISBN 90-04-14411-0 (alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. John—Social Scientific criticism. 2. Johannine school. 3. Christian sects—Rome. 4. Temple of Jerusalem (Jerusalem) in the Bible. 5. Bible. N.T. John—Comparative studies. 6. Dead Sea scrolls—Relation to the New Testament. 7. Qumran community. 8. Philo, of Alexandria. 9. Judaism—Relations. 10. Temple of Jerusalem (Jerusalem)—History of doctrines. I. Title. II. Series.

BS2615.52.F85 2005

296'.5'067—dc22

2005050084

ISSN 0167-9732

ISBN 90 04 14411 0

© Copyright 2005 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill Academic
Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal
use is granted by Brill provided that
the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright
Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910,
Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To my parents, Anna Karin and Knut Fuglseth

CONTENTS

Preface	xiii
1 Problem and Method	1
1.1 A Community with Many Names	1
1.2 Hermeneutic Challenges	6
1.3 Difficulties in Characterising the Johannine Community as a 'Sect'	9
1.3.1 'Sect' in Comparative Studies	9
1.3.2 'Sect' in Studies of the Early Church	12
1.3.3 'Sect' in Studies of the Johannine Community	15
1.3.4 Conclusions from the 'Sect' Debate	27
1.4 Two 'Test Cases' in a Comparative Perspective	28
1.5 Methodological Considerations	30
1.5.1 Sociological Challenges to the Study of John	30
1.5.2 Eliciting Socio-Cultural Information	31
1.5.3 The Use of Models in Biblical Investigations	38
1.6 Plan for Procedure	43
2 Models and Questions	45
2.1 The 'Sect', A Concept with Changing Meanings	45
2.2 Elliott's Application of Wilson's 'Sect'	49
2.3 The 'Cult' Model, an Alternative Model	51
2.3.1 'Cult, Sect and Church'	51
2.3.2 Modern Applications of the Model	57
2.3.3 Criticism of the Theory	59
2.4 Heuristic Questions to the Texts from the Models	62
3 From Text to Community	67
3.1 Was There a Johannine Community?	67
3.2 Constructive Conclusions	70
3.3 Analytical Conclusions	73
3.4 Comparative Conclusions	84

3.4.1	The New Testament Context	84
3.4.2	Was There a Philo Community?	86
3.4.3	Was There a Qumran Community?	105
3.5	Three Comparable Communities	113
4	John and the Temple	117
4.1	The Importance of the Temple Theme	117
4.1.1	Impossible to Make Too Much of the Temple	117
4.1.2	The Destruction of the Temple and the Johannine Community	119
4.2	Types of Temple References in John	123
4.3	Temple Attitudes in the New Testament Generally	128
4.4	The Temple Replacement Theory and John	136
4.5	The Temples in Jn 2:13–22	143
4.5.1	Temple Cleansing or Temple Rejection?	143
4.5.2	Formal Analysis	147
4.5.2.1	Location	147
4.5.2.2	Fusion of Pericopes	148
4.5.2.3	Structure	150
4.5.2.4	Formal Analysis and the Community	152
4.5.3	Near Context and Transitional Remarks	153
4.5.4	The First Temple Mentioned in Jn 2:14–17	156
4.5.5	The Second Temple Mentioned in Jn 2:18–22	161
4.5.6	Thematic Context	167
4.5.7	Three Possible Kinds of Relationships	174
4.6	The Proper Place and Mode of Worship in Jn 4	176
4.6.1	Another Two Temples and Two Kinds of Worship	176
4.6.2	The Alternative Way of Worship	179
4.7	A Synopsis of Jn 2 and 4	184
5	The Temple in Philo and Qumran	187
5.1	Philo and Qumran as Comparative Sources	187
5.2	The Temple in Philo's Writings	189
5.2.1	Was the Temple Interesting for Philo?	190
5.2.2	Jerusalem and the Temple	196

5.2.2.1	Struggle for the Jerusalem Temple	196
5.2.2.2	Temple Tax	199
5.2.2.3	Temple Buildings	200
5.2.3	Transferred Temple and Related Issues	201
5.2.3.1	The Genuine Sacrifice and Universal Temple	201
5.2.3.2	Allegorical Exegesis and Temple Relationship	203
5.2.3.3	Transferred Temple Building	206
5.2.3.4	Soul and Mind as Temple	208
5.2.3.5	Cosmos as Temple, Spec. 1:66ff	210
5.2.3.6	Other Transferred Temple Related Issues	213
5.2.4	Temple Ambivalence	216
5.3	The Temple in the Qumran Writings	219
5.3.1	Did the Qumran Community Reject the Temple?	219
5.3.2	Temple References	225
5.3.2.1	Types of Temple References	225
5.3.2.2	References to the Jerusalem Temple	225
5.3.2.3	References to Functions of the Temple	228
5.3.2.4	References to Transferred Temple and Temple Issues	232
5.3.3	The Ambiguities of 1QS 9:3ff	235
5.3.4	Purificatory After All	239
5.4	John, Philo, Qumran and the Temple in Comparison	240
6	Temple-Related Festivals in John	251
6.1	The Temple Approach	251
6.2	The Unknown Feast	254
6.3	The Passovers	259
6.3.1	The Main Themes	259
6.3.2	A Replaced Passover in Jn 6?	260
6.3.2.1	The Frame	260
6.3.2.2	The Passover Themes of Replacement	263

6.3.2.3	Manna as Replaced Object?	265
6.3.2.4	The Degree of Replacement	268
6.3.3	The Passover-Theme in Jn 11:55; 13–19	270
6.4	The Festival of Booths	273
6.4.1	Possible Replacement Motifs	273
6.4.2	Water as Replaced Object, Jn 7:37–44	276
6.4.3	Light as Replaced Object, Jn 8:12–20	277
6.5	Festival of the Dedication	278
6.6	Low Degree of Festival Tension	281
7	Social Relationships in John	285
7.1	Why an Investigation of Social Relationships?	285
7.2	Social Relationships in John	287
7.2.1	The World	287
7.2.2	The Samaritans	289
7.2.3	A Gentile Roman?	296
7.2.4	Gentile Greeks?	302
7.2.5	The ‘Other Sheep’?	307
7.2.6	The ‘Dispersed Children of God’?	310
7.2.7	‘Jews’ in the Temple and the Synagogue	314
7.3	A Variety of High and Low Tension	317
8	Social Relationships in Philo and Qumran	321
8.1	Social Relationships in Philo’s Writings	321
8.1.1	External Relationships Generally	321
8.1.2	Named Groups and Their Worship	325
8.1.2.1	Egyptians	325
8.1.2.2	Other Nations	328
8.1.3	The Universal Role of Israel	331
8.1.4	Conclusion: mixed tension	334
8.2	Social Relationships in Qumran Writings	336
8.2.1	The Uniqueness of the Community	336
8.2.2	Self-Description and Internal Rules in the Serek	338
8.2.3	External Relationships in 1QS	341
8.2.4	‘Outsiders’ in Other Texts	344
8.2.5	Inclusive or Exclusive?	349
8.3	Social Relationships in John, Philo, and Qumran	350

9	Conclusions	353
9.1	General Results	353
9.2	Earlier Applications of Different 'Sect' Models	356
9.3	The 'Sect' Model by Wilson and Elliott	357
9.4	The 'Cult' Model	360
9.4.1	A Circular Argument?	360
9.4.2	The Qumran Community Was 'Sectarian'	361
9.4.3	Philo Represents the 'Parent Body'	363
9.4.4	The Johannine Community Was 'Cultic'	364
	Appendices	375
	Abbreviations and Text Sources	375
	Bibliography	379
	General Index	411
	Modern Authors	423
	Tanak/Old Testament	429
	New Testament	431
	Philo of Alexandria	440
	Qumran Literature	445
	Josephus	449
	Varia	450

PREFACE

The present investigation incorporates three different approaches: a sociological, a historical, and a comparative approach. The sociological approach is grounded in modern sociology of religion and its models of new religious movements. The historical approach is above all reflected in the quest for the situation of the alleged Johannine community. The comparative approach led me to texts of Philo of Alexandria and from Qumran. I hope that I have been able to challenge some implicit and explicit presuppositions in the reading of John, particularly those related to the choice of *perspective* in the historical evaluation of the Johannine community.

The study is a revised version of my Dr.Art. thesis at the University of Trondheim or NTNU, the Norwegian University of Technology and Science, Faculty of Arts, Department of Religious Studies (September 2002.) My advisors were Peder Borgen and his successor at the New Testament chair, Jarl Ulrichsen. The main part of the work was undertaken during a 3-year scholarship granted by the Faculty of Arts from 1994 to 1997. My thanks are due above all to Peder Borgen. Without his encouragement and help, this study would never have been initiated or completed. Particularly, his invitation to join the group of editors working on the Norwegian Philo Concordance Project (together with Roald Skarsten) was important for the development of the present study. I am also indebted to Jarl Ulrichsen who has provided valuable criticism and suggestions for the project with unfailing precision. Of course, neither of them shares any responsibility for my errors.

In all four main fields of biblical research employed—that is social scientific or sociological criticism, the study of John, Philo, and the Qumran writings—I have had the opportunity to discuss my project with various scholars both in Norway and abroad. Parts of the thesis have been discussed personally or in seminars arranged by the Department with C. K. Barrett, Vernon Robbins, David E. Aune, Thomas Luckmann, Karl Olav Sandnes, Torleif Elgvin, Lars Hartman and Torrey Seland, as well as in one of the regular seminars at the Department and at The Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology (Menighetsfakultetet) in Oslo. I have also had the opportunity to

attend several scholarly conferences, among them the *Studiorum Novum Testamentum Societas* (SNTS) meetings in 1990, 1994, and 1998, the Nordic New Testament conference in Iceland in 1994—where I presented my thesis—and the Nordic Dead Sea Scrolls conference in Copenhagen in 1995. General methodological questions have been presented and discussed at a seminar arranged by the Faculty of Arts, led by professor Audun Øfsti (Department of Philosophy). I am also indebted to the members of the doctoral committee appointed by the Faculty for their helpful comments: Birger Olsson, Turid Karlsen Seim, and Jostein Ådna.

A special thanks to Erik Karlsaune at the Department of Religious Studies who once introduced me to and has taught me so much about the sociology of religion. I am also thankful to my present employer, The Faculty of Teacher Education, Bodø University College, for reducing my teaching obligations during the final stages of my work and for the funding of the English correction that was undertaken by Nancy Lea Eik-Nes and Nelleke Yakubu.

Without the support of my wife, Ellen, the whole project would never have been accomplished, and this book is dedicated to my parents in gratitude.

Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth
Bodø, Norway, March, 2005

CHAPTER ONE

PROBLEM AND METHOD

1.1 A COMMUNITY WITH MANY NAMES

This investigation is a study of the alleged community behind the Gospel of John, the so-called 'Johannine community'. The Gospel will be analysed with methods primarily derived from sociology and compared to texts from two contemporary Jewish milieus, the community in Alexandria as reflected in writings of Philo Judaeus and the community of Qumran as reflected in some of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Two issues are focused on as basis for the sociological analysis of John as well as for the comparison, i.e. the relationship to the Jerusalem temple and the social relationship to 'others' or 'outsiders' found in these writings.

Both the mere existence of a Johannine community and its social characteristics are much discussed issues, seen for instance by the fact that New Testament scholars have given the alleged group behind the Gospel of John various names. A simple presentation of names ascribed to the alleged group demonstrates the vast disparity of opinions. Alternatives flourish particularly among English-writing scholars, although 'community' seems to be the most commonly used notion in English. The examples are almost innumerable (see in particular Brown 1979; Neyrey 1988; Rensberger 1988; Quast 1989; Painter 1993; Koester 1995; Wahlde 1995). Along with 'community', we find 'congregation', 'church', 'school', 'conventicle', 'circle', 'group' and 'association', as well as 'addressees' and 'audience', with their equivalents in non-English languages. These names are in most cases not arbitrary labels put on the social milieu behind the Gospel and its writer, but reflect different basic understandings of the Gospel. Its social background is not necessarily looked upon as one single unity but also as a group of churches (Bull 1992:235; Martyn 1996). Usually the names are applied to one group or several groups behind all the Johannine writings, including the Revelation of John. In my discussions, however, the community as revealed in the Epistles of John will only partly be focused on and the Revelation completely

left out, although this choice reduces the literary deposit from which one may draw sociological conclusions.¹ Nevertheless, I shall follow the scholarly tradition that the Gospel originated in a local group or church of some kind and that the experiences of this group influenced the character and content of the text in a particular way—more than just being the indirect effect of general readers that an author had in mind. This is ‘the theory of the Johannine community’.²

The far most frequent name applied to this alleged community in Johannine scholarship during the last 30 years is ‘sect’, and the central aim of my investigation is to evaluate the claim that the Gospel of John was a product of a ‘sectarian’ milieu.

This ‘sectarian’ claim has been shaped in various forms and given different meanings, but what is of special interest to me are the analyses by scholars using *sociological* ‘sect’ models in their description of the social background of the Gospel. This is an application of models that describe in various degrees an exclusive group, socially and ideologically dissociated from its parent group and/or the general social environment and with strict and definite believers.³ Wayne A. Meeks was the first New Testament scholar to give the Johannine community the label ‘sectarian’ using at least some aspects of a sociological ‘sect’ model.⁴ Meeks argues that the mythical language in the Gospel functioned socially in an esoteric way for the community, dialectically reinforced by hostilities in its surroundings, and the Gospel thus reveals a kind of ‘sectarianism’ (cf. the title). Likewise,

¹ Including the Epistles is a common practice since the Epistles bear witness to an internal schism (1 Jn 2:18ff; 2 Jn 7ff; 3 Jn 9ff), see e.g. Brown (1979:93ff) and Bull (1992). Brown suggests that the Epistles should be read as a guide to the Gospel, a suggestion that makes much sense although it lacks direct support. The chronological relationship between the Johannine main writings is also uncertain. On the community behind Rev, see Aune (1997:liii–lvi) and Theissen (1988b:11).

² Martyn (1996:124) declares that Käsemann, Meeks, and himself converge in the conviction that the Gospel originated in a local church distinct from types of Christianity in the ‘Great Church’. This stands in marked difference with the individualistic approach by Bultmann (1971:457ff; cf. 1950), although he, too, speaks of a community in connection with the Farewell discourse.

³ Early sociologists of religion in fact took their reading of the New Testament concerning early Christianity as empirical background for the development of their ‘sect’ typology, see the introduction in O’Dea (1966:66ff), cf. M. Weber (1993:93), H. Niebuhr (1957); Troeltsch (1981).

⁴ Meeks ‘The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism’ (1972). Scroggs (1975) was perhaps the first NT scholar who applied an explicit sociological ‘sect’ model. Meeks’ article is highly esteemed, see Martyn (1996:137, n. 7); Neyrey (1988:xi).

Brown elaborated the concept of 'Johannine community' from the assumption of a conflict with the synagogue-milieu in John's neighbourhood. He probed into the community, critically evaluating the 'sectarian' picture presented by Meeks and found it partly inappropriate since the picture of the Community in the Gospel presented a community that was not totally isolated from the general Christian movement, seen clearly by the acknowledgement of Peter in Jn 21 (Brown 1979:90–91, 162).

It was the introduction of a redaction-critical approach in combination with form criticism that paved the way for investigating the Gospel as a writing that not only presented the history of Jesus, but also the situation and the historical development of a community. This combined approach applied to the Fourth Gospel was introduced by Martyn (1968; 1979) as well as in other publications (Martyn 1977; 1978).⁵ Martyn analyses the Gospel on two distinct levels of drama, making it possible to discern the Jesus tradition from the influence of the community and its environment by the development of the gospel form and vice versa.⁶ The second level reflects both a past and a present level in the history of the Johannine community. In a way, the 'conversation continued' between the two levels where particularly the role of Moses plays an important role in the Johannine conversation with a synagogue milieu (1979:99).⁷

This redaction-critical perspective plays a major role in my investigation, but will be combined with a social scientific approach in what one may call a 'socio-redaction criticism' (Esler 1987:6) and with additional studies of comparison.⁸ It is not a study of Johannine

⁵ Martyn notes (1979:13) that the major theses of the first edition in 1968 'have won a rather wide following', referring for instance to Pancaro (1975:492). Cf. the German discussion by Wengst (1981), Schnelle (1987), Onuki (1984) and Frühwald-König (1998), Rahner (1998) as well as Bieringer, Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneville (2001b:10, n. 19). On form criticism and the two levels in the narrative, see Martyn (1979:24, n. 8).

⁶ The distinction is analytic, i.e. the author was probably not conscious of what Martyn has termed 'the two-level drama' (1979:89). It is the Paraclete that so to say creates the two-level drama, see the statements concerning the Paraclete in Jn 14:15–17, 25–26; 15:26–27; 16:5–11, 12–15 (1979:143ff). He does not find the third, future level, in the same way as can be said about the apocalyptic genre where such a stereoptic vision is looked upon as necessary (Martyn 1979:135–137).

⁷ According to Martyn, the *continued* conversation is indicated in connection with the pleading question of Jn 10:20: 'Why are you listening to them' (1979:90).

⁸ I am not aware of studies on the Gospel of John using this combination of a sociological analysis and a comparative approach on a large scale. My own thesis

theology, Christology, or ecclesiology as such.⁹ Using a sociological method, with its cross-disciplinary way of analysis, that is closely related to redaction-critical analysis, my approach may be looked upon as a possible way of discerning the ecclesiology of an editor, but this is not my main perspective.¹⁰ This choice also limits the main scope of my presentation of secondary literature on the Gospel to the particular sociological debate. Nevertheless, in my discussion of the Fourth Gospel, the quest for the author and genesis of the Johannine text, the quest for the original Johannine milieu and the Johannine

was tentatively presented in Norwegian (Fuglseth 1994) and finally in English (Fuglseth 2002). Similar problems have been discussed lately in Painter, Culpepper, and Segovia (2002). A similar perspective with a comparison between new religious movements past and present has been employed in short studies by several scholars in Bilde and Rothstein (1999a), but not applied to the Gospel of John particularly. For monographs on the Gospel of John with a sociological perspective, see especially Neyrey (1988), Petersen (1993), Blasi (1996) as well as Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998)—following up their social science commentary on the Synoptic Gospels (1992), Stibbe, (1992) and Neyrey (1998:107). Malina, Rohrbaugh and Petersen study ‘the anti-language of an anti-society’ in this connection referring to the language of the Gospel and the community, an approach that includes aspects of my topic. Blasi, a social scientist, also applies a perspective similar to mine, but not with the same focus and with an almost total lack of textual studies. Stibbe (1992) comes close to a sociological study with his evaluation of the *social* function of John’s narrative. Neyrey (1998:107) claims that the ‘sociology of secrecy invites a fresh consideration of the internal tensions and conflicts in the sectarian group known as the Johannine circle’. His approach has several merits particularly concerning the information control seen in the Gospel, but the model is not meant to challenge the ‘sectarian’ way of thinking about the Johannine community. Esler compares the Johannine community with specific kinds of ‘sect’ sub-groups according to Wilson (1973). I shall comment further on some of these studies in due course.

⁹ The lack of ecclesiological themes in John known from Paul and the Synoptics are evident, such as ἐκκλησία, the question of baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and the existence of any kind of rules or church order. We have at best some allusions. Bultmann (1984:443) points to the fact that the church is not treated as a theme in John as it is in Paul (he sees the allusions to baptism and the Eucharist in Jn 3:5; 6:51c–58; 19:34b–35 as secondary). Based on the witness from the Johannine Epistles he also thinks that the church was not completely uninteresting for John, the Gospel simply does not demonstrate such an interest. Käsemann (1967:65) likewise concludes that there is no explicit ecclesiology in John. Barrett (1978:96) on the other hand rightly sees a doctrine of church summed up in the symbolic discourses of the Shepherd (10:1–16) and of the Vine (15:1–6). In addition, the subject is both directly and indirectly treated in studies on Johannine ecclesiology, see e.g. Schnelle (1991); Hengel (1993); Roloff (1993:290ff).

¹⁰ Brown (1979:13ff) demonstrates how these two interests or levels may converge. Van Belle’s bibliography (1988) has entries both on ‘ecclesiology’ (72 entries) and ‘community’ generally (23 entries) thus also presenting the division of scholarly interest.

teaching about the church (directly or indirectly) converge in an analysis using modern sociological models as modes of understanding.¹¹

With all its theological, historical, and literary particularities, speculations on a distinct background of a writing like this naturally are at hand. Exegetes often express the inherent particularities in the Gospel by speaking of the Johannine question, enigma, or problem.¹² Thyen discerns between ‘alte und neue “johanneische Frage”’ (1988:200). As Thyen sees it, the ‘old questions’ concerned only the question of authorship and the synoptic relationship. Bultmann formulated the ‘new questions’ by arguing that the explanation to the peculiarities cannot be found in a comparison with Paul or the Synoptics.¹³ Three main aspects of the riddle may be discerned: the historical (the quest for the place of the Johannine Christianity within the broader early church movement), the dogmatic or theological problem (the quest for an explanation of its central idea), and the literary or redactional riddle (the quest for explaining its composition). Ashton rightly focuses on all these aspects seen in Bultmann’s works and points to the fact that ‘this enigma has yet to receive its satisfactory solution’ and a few years earlier he concluded that it was still ‘the most marvellous enigma’ (Ashton 1986:2, cf. 1991) in the history of early Christianity.¹⁴ My investigation concerns mainly the historical aspects, but the quest for a community behind the Gospel adds a sociological dimension to the historical explanation that includes a quest for the social

¹¹ A similar combination is applied by Smith (1974–1975:222).

¹² ‘The Johannine Question’ (Bacon 1910), the ‘problem of the fourth gospel’ (Barrett 1978:3ff), ‘the Johannine problem’ (Martyn 1979:17), ‘the problem of John’ (Ashton 1991:3; Boer 1996:19ff), or ‘the Johannine enigma’ (Ashton 1986:2). The classic formulations of the problem can be traced back to Wellhausen and Schwartz at the beginning of the twentieth century (Schnelle 1987:12ff). Yet there is no general consensus on how to solve the problem. Martyn (1979:17) states that the problem has grown during the last quarter-century. The structural attempts to solve the problem are not commented upon by me. This means that although in many ways similar of theme, the approach and results of Østenstad (1998) are left out.

¹³ Several other scholars have argued that external sources must be evaluated, and Bauer (1933:3) found, as Bultmann, gnostic motifs in the Gospel (cf. Schottroff 1970).

¹⁴ ‘Das wundervollste Rätsel’, Ashton (1986:2) quotes Harnack and his ‘Dogmengeschichte’ from 1886, and also Martyn (1979:17), Fortna (1988), and Brodie (1993:3) all refer to Harnack. The many disagreements among New Testament scholars are disturbing from a traditional historical-critical point of view, cf. my own presentation and discussion concerning historical criticism and biblical interpretation by Newton and Herder representing two different kinds of approach to biblical scholarship (Fuglseth 2000).

circumstances and situation for the audience of the writing. The community aspect could be called the fourth aspect of the Johannine problem, not included in Bultmann's perspective (Ashton 1991:101). As the majority of exegetes have rejected Bultmann's source theories, his interpretation collapsed with it (Ashton 1991:45).

Meeks' interests in the social and 'sectarian' function of the Johannine language inaugurated a new trend in Johannine scholarship, although he has various predecessors in the history of the Johannine scholarship who did not use specific social scientific notions.¹⁵ Contributions supporting the 'sectarian' claim using a sociological approach are likewise not limited to investigations that explicitly employ the notion 'sect', but time and space do not permit a direct and broad discussion of previous and present 'sect'-like characterisations of the Gospel. The vast impact of Meeks' article is particularly indicated by the fact that several scholars, mostly Americans, have followed his example, using 'sect' in a similar way.¹⁶ From an international perspective, however, the 'sectarian' debate concerning the Gospel of John is, as I shall demonstrate, far from unanimous (1.3).

1.2 HERMENEUTIC CHALLENGES

The notion 'sect' is often implemented in contemporary theological and ecclesiological applications of the Gospel.¹⁷ There are, however, several hermeneutic problems involved both in the application of the notion 'sect' and in assuming that the Gospel of John presupposes not only a conflict with a (local) Jewish synagogue or their place of meeting, but also that this synagogue was responsible for the group's

¹⁵ Form critics often discuss the social background of the Gospel under categories such as 'origin' and 'Sitz im Leben', see the contributions by Bultmann (1984:443), Schweizer (1959b, cf. 1959a) and Cullmann (1975). Dahl discusses similar matters under titles referring to 'church' and 'people' (1962) and the equivalent terms in 'Das Volk Gottes' (1963).

¹⁶ Smith (1974–1975); Culpepper (1975); Bogart (1977:139); Segovia (1981); Rensberger (1988:27). Fortna (1970a; 1970b; 1988) follows up on Martyn's thesis by using source studies to demonstrate that the development of the Johannine community, as pointed out by Martyn, can actually be traced in the literary development of the Gospel. His 'sign source' is a lengthy narrative source with a passion story, cf. Brodie (1993) and van Belle (1994).

¹⁷ The main purpose of Barton (1993:141) is to evaluate the hidden ecclesiological program of scholars using the 'sect' typology. What I am focusing on in this passage is the deliberate hermeneutic use of the notion, cf. Segovia (1996; 1998).

expulsion from this institution. Without going into hermeneutic discussions of how to make use of the biblical matter in ethical or ecclesiological teaching today, I would like at least to point out some difficulties involved in the transformation of historical evaluations based on modern sociological types to a present situation in order to find a normative function. To avoid a circular argument, an analysis of the modern presuppositions of the models employed must be undertaken, particularly since the consensus of the 'sectarian' solution concerning the Johannine community is not as evident as many scholars seem to presume.

Several scholars present a hermeneutic purpose as their point of departure in a theological understanding of the 'sect' today. Rensberger (1988; 1998) discusses the notion in connection with the modern liberating theology and he wants to use what he looks upon as fruitful aspects of the 'sectarian' notion. In the Johannine fight against religious institutions for instance, there is a certain '*antiestablishment*' in its theology (1998:144). Meeks (1996) takes the 'sectarian' status of John as a fait accompli arguing on that basis that 'the world' today may need a more 'sectarian' church, that in fact 'sectarianism' might be one of the church's strengths.¹⁸ Kysar even speaks of a 'coming hermeneutic earthquake in Johannine interpretation' (1996:185). He argues that the interpretation of the Gospel in the twenty-first century will be reshaped by two essential questions (at least in North America): the 'sectarian', exclusivistic features of John against 'transsectarian' and inclusivistic features, and the ambiguities contrasted with absolute claims of truth. He is right that the exclusive features must be further defined, but both he and several other scholars take the 'sectarian' nature for granted too much.¹⁹

¹⁸ 'Ironically, in a time when Christianity has been domesticated into a polite hobby and a cheering section for vested social interests, the sectarian stance may be just what the 'world' needs as well' (Meeks 1996:325), cf. similar ideas in Meeks (2003:161).

¹⁹ The development of a pluralist society in North America is probably indicative for a development that will accentuate Kysar's challenge on a global scale too, at least in Europe. The general approach of my investigation is sociological rather than theological, but there are obvious theological presuppositions and preconceived answers in the modern models themselves. However, in a secular world a pure theological understanding of the Gospel runs the risk of barring the New Testament to the many secularised readers, see Theissen (1999:1) who defends his sociological method by arguing this way. He defines the normative theological or confessional premise of sociological reading as 'God has redeemed the world in Christ and brought human life to its fulfilment'.

O'Day employs a hermeneutic understanding of the Gospel in a discussion of different models of atonement. She argues that the understanding of atonement in John is based on a model of restoration of relationship (O'Day 1996:201–203). The theory is interesting from my perspective since it also suggests an alternative to the temple replacement theory in Johannine scholarship, a theory that I also think is taken for granted too much by some scholars (cf. my chapters 4 and 6). By challenging replacement theories one challenges the basis of the 'sectarian' hypothesis, as will be shown.

The strength of the 'sectarian' approach in a hermeneutic perspective has above all been seen in the explanation of the assumed anti-Judaism of the Gospel. As such, it may be able to devaluate the general theological significance of this particular Johannine feature that has often nurtured anti-Semitism in Christian churches. Several studies of John have been motivated from this hermeneutic point as well as the Jewish-Christian dialogue in a post-Shoah context and I would like to join them in the task.²⁰ The matter is often reduced to a question of doctrines, and sociology may add valuable insights.²¹

As I indicated above, modern normative applications of the Gospel taking the theory concerning the synagogue conflict as a way to conceive and neutralise the general relationship to the 'Jews' in the Gospel, are not without problems. Reinhartz (1998:114; cf. 2001a:213) argues rightly that the expulsion hypothesis does not undo the anti-Jewish rhetoric in the Gospel since it is still the 'Jews' that are to be blamed for the expulsion. She would rather see its problematic portrayal of the 'Jews' as a consequence of the community's ongoing struggle for self-definition. As she points out, there are arguments

²⁰ Smith (1995:9) states the three most important questions that the Gospel raises today: the understanding of the Gospel message in the modern world; the relation to other religions, particularly its parent faith, and the Christian church's understanding of who she is and what she is about. My main interest is the second point, i.e. the relationship to Judaism. The difficulties involved in the historical part of this problem are demonstrated by the variety of solutions presented lately, see Casey (1996); Motyer (1997). Charlesworth (1996:80–81) rightly questions our modern use of the word 'Jew'.

²¹ Bieringer, Pollefeyt, and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (2001a) have collected valuable articles discussing the possible anti-Judaism of John, but the editors in their introduction and several other contributors discuss mainly doctrinal problems. From a doctrinal point of view, opposing views seem to be impossible. In a real social situation, however, ambivalence is quite possible. The ambivalence is well taken care of by Frühwald-König (1998) who has reached similar conclusion to me, but from another perspective, i.e. Christology.

to conclude that there was never any formal expulsion of Jewish Christians from the synagogues, but the hermeneutic problems cannot direct the historical investigation. If an expulsion of this kind seems plausible, we will have to find other solutions to the hermeneutic or pragmatic problems.²²

1.3 DIFFICULTIES IN CHARACTERISING THE JOHANNINE COMMUNITY AS A 'SECT'

1.3.1 '*Sect*' in *Comparative Studies*

The notion 'sect' has been frequently connected with several groups in the New Testament world, not only the alleged group behind the Fourth Gospel, a procedure that causes much confusion. Scholars may, in fact, use the 'sect' notion to describe *every* Jewish direction of the time. 'Sectarian' aspects of the Gospel of John and the Qumran writings have been compared and, among other issues, scholars have connected their apparently common dualistic language, making it possible to see a Palestinian background for the Gospel, a possibility not so evident before the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls.²³ Nevertheless, I shall argue that the categorisation using a common sociological label of 'sect' in a comparison of the Johannine community with other groups, such as the Qumran Essenes, is highly questionable.

The alleged Qumran community and other antique Jewish groups have been called 'sects' by scholars like Smith, P. Davies, Charlesworth, S. Cohen, Schiffman, and Segal. Smith (1974–1975:224) argues that

²² Concerning the problems related to the alleged church-synagogue conflict, see chapter 3. It is not difficult to conclude with Culpepper (1996:126–127; cf. 2001:61ff) that the challenge is an ethical one and that Christian interpreters still have much to do. Brown (1979:69) is correct today, too, with his statement that the basic Johannine hermeneutic difficulty still faces us.

²³ Scholars soon discovered the structural similarities between the emerging Christian movement and the Qumran community, see Stendahl (1957:7) who calls both groups 'sects'. For the comparison between the Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is important to note that the Qumran material has preserved a kind of dualism not reflected in the writings of Philo or Josephus, but there might be a common 'mentality' with John despite the substantial differences concerning the significance of Jesus. See also the analyses in Langbrandtner (1977:179ff); Bergmeier (1980:14ff); Charlesworth (1991a; 1996:70–74), Esler (1994:70ff); Aune (2003).

the Gospel of John and the Epistles reveal a 'sectarian consciousness, a sense of exclusiveness, a sharp delineation of the community from the world'. Likewise, he contends that a comparison with a Qumran writing like 'the Manual of Discipline' (The Rule of the Community) demonstrates terminological similarities and a fundamental dualism demonstrating separation and also an exclusiveness that 'are echoed in the community-consciousness of the Johannine literature' (1974–1975:240). P. Davies (1996:163ff) defines the group behind the Damascus Document as a 'sect', also linking his definition to a particular group of specific sociological standards. Charlesworth (1996:79–80) finds so many similarities between the Johannine Epistles and the Qumran literature that he does not hesitate to call both the originating groups 'sects'. Esler (1994:91) concludes that the Qumran community and the Johannine community were both 'introversionist sects' (cf. Wilson 1973) because of the marked difference between themselves and the outside world. S. Cohen (1987) calls the Qumran scrolls 'sectarian' writings and the group, he argues, was thus similar to other groups in the Second Temple period, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Christians. Schiffman (1995:73) refers in a similar broad way 'to all Jewish groups as sects, regardless of size and importance'. Segal (1986; 1990) also uses 'sect' as a notion describing several groups in first century Judaism and points to the fact that two of these directions at a later point established separate religions, now known as Judaism and Christianity.

Both this shifting use of the notion 'sect' and its application to different groups are confusing and underline the problems that are involved.²⁴ First, why use the notion at all if it has no substantial meaning, but is just used as an equivalent to general notions like 'party' or 'direction'? There is a scholarly tradition of Bible studies using the term in a highly general way and in a sociological discussion of these groups such a definition is of very little help. It has only relatively weak explanatory power (Holmberg 1990:108–114; Barton 1993:158).²⁵ The notion has particular sociological connota-

²⁴ Segovia (1982:204) also points to the looseness with which the term has been used by Johannine scholars, evident by the fact that 'each exegete had seized upon a different constitutive element of the community as the basis for his judgement.'

²⁵ Cf. the criticism by Holmberg (1990:98–99) on the lack of sociological significance by Rowland (1985:65) who deliberately chooses not to follow the traditional sociological definition of 'sect' and 'sectarianism'.

tions and using it incognizantly confuses the general discussion and should therefore be avoided.

Secondly, taking the substantial stance, saying that a 'sect' is a very particular and exclusive group, is it really fair to say that all of these first century Jewish movements in question were 'sects'? In accordance with some of the aforementioned scholars, this is not likely. One reason for not embracing this conclusion immediately is that the later history of the Johannine and Qumran writings does not support the thesis: While the Johannine writings became a prevailing part of the Christian canon and spread all over the world, the writings of the Qumran community were soon forgotten and literally buried for almost two thousand years. This could be accidental, or rather a consequence of social differences not captured by applying the notion 'sectarian'.²⁶ A view on the Qumran community that, until recently, was common, was that its members were part of the direction that the classical sources call 'Essene'. According to this view, these particular Qumran Essenes lived isolated in the Wilderness of Judaea in some kind of a monastery, a thesis in part deducted from the detailed prescriptions found in some of the remaining scrolls.²⁷ Particularly in the manuscripts of the Serek (1QS et al.), we find rules obviously pertaining to a strict community order of life. A quick comparison with John reveals differences of contents and form (Martínez and Barrera 1995:214–216). There might be an indirect dependence between John and Qumran, but 'indirect dependence' is an unclear historical conception (Aune 2003). The Qumranic prescriptions do not find equivalents in the Gospel of John, yet another fact that warns us against a common labelling from the outset on.

E. P. Sanders and Baumgarten take a slightly different stance where modern notions are concerned. E. P. Sanders (1977:425–426) points to the very fact that notions like 'party' and 'sect' are used interchangeably by scholars, but that he prefers to discern between them, making a distinction, quite rightly I think, on the basis of

²⁶ The differences between the Qumran and the Christian writings generally are of course differences of beliefs (see Smith 2000:17), but this should not hinder us in trying to find the broader social conditions underlying these beliefs as well as the social impacts coming to expression in them.

²⁷ This judgement has been radically challenged after the publication of the remaining manuscripts, see chapter 3.

‘soteriological exclusivism’. The Dead Sea Scrolls are thus definitely ‘sectarian’ literature, while other groups at the time were mere ‘parties’ within Judaism. As the scholars mentioned above, Baumgarten (1997:5–11, 19) also uses ‘sect’ in quite a broad way, but he is well aware of the necessity of a proper definition and the difficulties in using notions too broad to explain anything. Thus, he initially declares that Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes and ‘those who lived at Qumran’ were all groups that can be called ‘sects’ since they all posit some degree of dissent.²⁸ What is of major importance, however, is that for the sake of a clear distinction he introduces sub-categories according to modern sociological theories.²⁹

Initially then, there are reasons to believe that at least the Johannine and the Qumran communities should not be described using the same notions or models. Moreover, there are other difficulties in categorising the Johannine community as a ‘sect’, difficulties that become evident when we consider the scholarly discussion on the Johannine community.

1.3.2 ‘Sect’ in *Studies of the Early Church*

The history of the sociological definitions of ‘sect’ has a distinguished pedigree in the classical literature of the sociology of religion, with a tradition going back to scholars like M. Weber, Troeltsch, and H. Niebuhr. It has since been steadily developed and refined. Some sociologists still use it, others have abandoned it, as I shall demonstrate in chapter 2. The modern social scientific approach to the reading of the Bible has a shorter story.³⁰ In the 1990s, numerous

²⁸ He wants to distinguish ‘as carefully as possible between the Essenes and Qumran’ (Baumgarten 1997:1, n. 1).

²⁹ Baumgarten (1997:7) does not study Christian or Jewish-Christian groups because he limits his study to groups that emerged before the first century CE. He is also more concerned about the historical conditions for the emergence of different Jewish groups and movements. He argues that Pharisees and Sadducees were ‘reformist’ while the Qumranites were ‘introversionists’ in accordance with the typology of Wilson (Baumgarten 1997:13). On Wilson (1973; 1990), see particularly chapter 2.

³⁰ In the post-war literature, we find early contributions by Judge (1960) and Malherbe (1977). In the 1980s, we find early contributions like Tidball (1983), Kee (1980; 1989), and Scroggs (1980). Important for the discussion of ‘sectarianism’ were the contributions in E. P. Sanders (1981–1983) who discussed self-definitions. These studies have played an important role in the description and making of an upcoming field of research. There are also general Scandinavian presentations that

general introductions and evaluations of the sociological method or social scientific criticism of the New Testament were published, in historical as well as in sociological journals.³¹ All these will not be discussed in depth here, but their viewpoints have often been helpful—particularly for my methodological considerations.

It was in the 1970s and 1980s, when ‘biblical scholars started to take sociology more seriously’ (Gill 1996:1), that the sociological notion ‘sect’ became a working instrument for many scholars. However, Scroggs (1975:1) regrets the neglect of earlier sociological studies in the New Testament studies at that time, and he mentions Troeltsch among others. In the late 1970s, an early contributor like Theissen in ‘Soziologie der Jesusbewegung’ (1988b), defines ‘the Jesus movement’, by using a ‘sectarian’-like perspective, but without using the notion itself. He stresses the renewal aspect of the Jesus group in this connection, a central notion in the later discussion.³²

The notion ‘renewal’ is, however, ambiguous: it can refer both to renewal along *new* roads as along *old* roads, and it is above all this distinction (or lack of it), I think, that causes the confusion. Holmberg (1978:183) intercepts that distinction when he argues against the use of a ‘sectarian’ label on the first Christians because the aspect of renewal among them means that they did *not* look upon themselves as a group within traditional Judaism. J. T. Sanders concludes that early Palestinian Christianity was *not* a ‘sect’ since it did *not* reject the culture of traditional Judaism.³³ Watson (1986:38ff) argues that

have been significant for the development of my study, like Moxnes (1988c), Nissen, (1989) and Holmberg (1978; 1990). Moxnes has presented several studies on the use of social anthropology and on economics and ethics in that connection, as well as other general introductions, see Moxnes (1983; 1986; 1988a; 1988b; 1993; 1994a; 1994b). Moxnes (1994b:154) points to the essential place of the application of Clifford Geertz’ notion of ‘ethos’ in early social scientific criticism.

³¹ A general introduction to central themes in the sociology of Christianity’s beginnings was presented in the sociological journal ‘Social Compass’ (1992) with a selected bibliography. A thorough general description of social scientific criticism on the New Testament, its achievements as well as a description of the method is Elliott’s (1993, cf. 2001). Other important assessments are the aforementioned review of secondary literature by Holmberg (1990); Blasi (1991); Esler (1994; 1995). One may also include May (1991); Horsley (1994); Kee (1995); Horrell (1999) to the list of major introductions to the field in the period.

³² ‘Das Urchristentum begann als eine von Jesus hervorgerufene innerjüdische Erneuerungsbewegung’ (Theissen 1988b:9, cf. 1977).

³³ J. T. Sanders’ study (1993) describes the emerging church in several areas up to the second Jewish revolt. He is not content to use only *one* modern model, but investigates several social scientific theories and models to explain the relationship

the Pauline churches were 'sects', while the Qumran and the Johannine communities started out as reform movements, but were later transformed into 'sects', with definitions in some similarity with the above distinction between new and old roads of renewal.³⁴ Mack (1993:63) defines a theory of 'sectarian' formation as a theory that claims that 'the early church emerged from within Judaism as the fulfilment of Israel's promise, as its righteous remnant'.³⁵ Within or outside Judaism, rejection or acceptance, fulfilment or inventions? Without a common definition, this discussion will easily turn out to be a pseudo-discussion.

There are several other studies on other New Testament writings similar to my study on 'sectarian' aspects, but with different kinds of definitions of the notions.³⁶ Elliott (1981:101ff) examines 1 Peter and finds it 'sectarian'.³⁷ He defines 'sect' much in accordance with the definitions of Bryan Wilson such as these were formulated at

between Jews and Christians at the time. Other theories from the social sciences that are used by J. T. Sanders to aid explanation are the cultural anthropological (or social anthropological) 'group and grid' theory from M. Douglas (1966), 'conflict' theory and 'deviance' theory from various authors. He himself finds more help in a conflict and a deviance model (J. T. Sanders 1993:150).

³⁴ 'Reform movements' and 'sects' are regarded as opposite ends of a spectrum, and the essential difference between them is that the 'reform adopts a hopeful attitude towards society' whereas 'the sect adopts a hostile and undifferentiated view of society' (Watson 1986:39). Watson is much in accordance with the typology of E. P. Sanders and Baumgarten.

³⁵ Mack rejects the solution that 'sect' theories might explain the rapid expansion of the Jesus movement (1993:62). Mack's alternative is, however, based on a rather dubious theory concerning the role of 'Q' as an independent writing and with different layers that bears witness to the early Christian movement in opposition to a later development.

³⁶ See Gager (1975) and Elliott (1981) on 1 Peter. Social scientific models in connection with the interpretation of the Gospel of Luke are presented by Esler (1987) and Neyrey (1991). On Matthew, see Saldarini (1994); Stanton (1994), on Mark, see Kee (1977); Beavis (1989), and on Luke, see Moxnes (1994a). In relation to the 1 Cor, see Robbins (1996b:176–178). See also Craffert (2001:26–27). As mentioned above, together with Rohrbach, Malina has followed up his sociological perspective in two aforementioned commentaries on the Synoptic Gospels (1992) and on the Gospel of John (1998). On Paul, see the works of Meeks mentioned above, as well as the aforementioned Watson (1986) and MacDonald (1988). See also the evaluation of the pertinent literature using the 'sect' model in one way or the other in Elliott (1998:277–278; 2001) and Esler (1994:13ff). Malina (1981) introduced a somewhat different approach with his use of modern Mediterranean models from social anthropological studies like 'honour' and 'shame'.

³⁷ Elliott has later presented a general evaluation of the 'sect' model in New Testament scholarship (1993:34–35), a presentation criticised by Olsson (1995). See also Elliott (2001) and Craffert (2001) in a discussion of Malina's views on the 'sect' model in biblical research.

that time. Wilson introduced what he considered to be a novel and true sociological way of understanding the ‘sect’, and already early in the 1970s, in ‘Magic and the Millennium’ (1973), he criticised what he looked upon as the theological and doctrinal dominated typology of Troeltsch.³⁸ Likewise, scholars often avoid the dependence on doctrinal criteria³⁹ and some scholars have also discussed other ‘sect’-like models in the description of New Testament writings. We find ‘sect’-like perspectives on other New Testament writings when scholars draw on sociological theories of ‘deviance’ (Barclay 1995; J. T. Sanders 1993), ‘small groups development’ (Malina 1995), ‘conversion’ theories (Taylor 1995).⁴⁰

1.3.3 ‘Sect’ in *Studies of the Johannine Community*

The traditional use of the notion from M. Weber, Troeltsch, and H. Niebuhr is also visible in the Johannine scholarship, defended and attacked.

The perspective in the article by Meeks in which he defines the Johannine community as ‘sectarian’, can be seen as belonging to that same sociological tradition. Meeks calls the Johannine group ‘sectarian’ although he does not identify this kind of ‘sect’ with any specific ‘sect’ model in the modern sociological tradition. He states that his model is different from the classic definitions (Meeks 1972:70; n. 79). Nevertheless, he does define the group as a group with

³⁸ Wilson (1990:3–4) demonstrates how the concept of ‘sect’ has changed in time. Wilson calls the study from Troeltsch a ‘socio-theological’ study. Troeltsch called the types he discovered (church, sect and mysticism) ‘Three types of Christian *thought*’ (italics mine).

³⁹ Fossum has employed a definition explicitly taken from Troeltsch, but without depending on doctrinal criteria (Fossum 1996:240, n. 1). He uses the notion ‘church’ as denoting groups or religious systems ‘which had adapted more or less to the prevalent politics and culture’—such as Samaritanism and Sadduceism (1996:240). This typology is similar to the one that I have adopted in this study, except for the criterion of adherence on the basis of conviction or experience. This criterion reflects a psychological perspective that I find difficult to apply to the first century.

⁴⁰ The conflict model makes it possible to see the proclamation of Jesus as an ideological response to the conflict between Jews and Jewish Christians, and not as its first cause. The deviance theory explains why mainstream Judaism under political, economic and military pressure reacted so severely against the deviant Christians; it was necessary ‘in order to preserve its boundaries, its self-identity as a culture’ and thus intolerable (J. T. Sanders 1993:150). He argues that models from new religious movements and new ‘sect’ theories similar to these theories on new religious movement are fruitful.

'...totalistic and exclusive claims' (1972:70–71) and refers to the sociological theories of the sociologists P. Berger and Luckmann (1967).⁴¹ They do not present a distinct theory of 'sects' connected to their phenomenological sociology, so what Meeks refers to here is the general dialectic theory of these sociologists.⁴² Meeks extended his sociological analysis and conclusions of the Johannine community in later publications on other New Testament writings in compliance with this sociological tradition.⁴³ In an article from 1985, Meeks (1985:103 and n. 27) even refers to an acceptance in these matters in accordance with his own theories, and Barton (1993: 140–141) rightly states that the use of the model to various aspects of early Christianity is 'commonplace' and that there is a 'consensus that the first Christians did constitute a sectarian movement'. However, there are several objections to the approach as indicated by Barton himself (see below).

Meeks attaches his theories on the Gospel of John to the scholarly tradition of Bultmann, stressing the essential role of the 'Redeemer-myth' in his understanding of the Gospel (Meeks 1972:44).⁴⁴ Bultmann

⁴¹ This sociology of knowledge has gained general acknowledgement but its basis in Husserlian phenomenology is often misunderstood. Motyer (1997:30–31) points to the fact that P. Berger and Luckmann themselves warn against this use of their theory since no social phenomenon can be studied apart from its overall social structure, and these theories have been misapplied by Meeks. Holmberg (1990:118ff) criticises this application of sociology of knowledge on the understanding of the Bible and particularly in the problems of finding a correlation between symbolic and social structures. Barton (1993:149–150) finds Meeks' functionalism much too deterministic because it is described as dialectic. The problem is, I think, not the dialectic principle itself, but rather the static determinism that is attached to the dialectic process by some historians.

⁴² P. Berger (1954) touches upon some aspects of 'sectarianism', particularly the development of group-consciousness. See also P. Berger and Luckmann (1967:143–144) on 'sects' as sub-societies.

⁴³ Meeks has also studied the Pauline communities (Meeks 1979; 1983a; 1983b; 1985; 1986). He says that early Christianity was 'sectarian' because 'the organizing centre of the group's identity consisted in a constellation of beliefs and patterns of behavior that was not, as a whole, shared by other groups of Jews' (1986:98). 'Like other Jewish sects, it [the Jesus movement] drew the boundaries of the sacred community differently and more narrowly than did the established leaders in Jerusalem', Meeks (1986:99) claims. The approach has also been seminal for the development of other new methods of New Testament exegesis. See the positive evaluation of the method of this article by Robbins (1996b:144–145) who sees the article as essential for the development of the 'socio-rhetorical' method.

⁴⁴ The source-critical studies on John are particularly focused on by Fortna (1970b; 1988), but he uses the method in another direction. Ashton (1991) honours Bultmann for asking the right questions, but declares that the solutions were wrong (1991:45).

(1925) contended that the only thing that the revealer Jesus revealed was that Jesus was a revealer. Meeks claims that Jesus also reveals that Jesus is an enigma. By analysing the social functions of the language pattern, Meeks attempts to understand the Gospel with the Johannine community as a key of interpretation. Like Martyn (e.g. 1968; 1979), Meeks also wants to take the expulsion from the synagogue (cf. the use of ἀποσυνάγωγος in Jn 9:22; 12:42; 16:2) as a historical and firm basis in the reconstruction of the social characteristics of a Jewish-Christian community.⁴⁵

Meeks took the Johannine myth of the descending and ascending Son of Man as his point of departure. The myth is presented in the Gospel through the pattern of expressions of καταβαίνω and ἀναβαίνω. It is exactly this myth that presents Jesus as an enigma, or as the Stranger, and it is this mythical Jesus that separates Jesus from the 'world'.⁴⁶ In the dialogue with Nicodemus, for instance, John presents Jesus as incomprehensible. The last part of Jn 3, in which the themes from the conversation with Nicodemus are recaptured, shows that the purpose of the discourse was 'only and purely to indicate his [Jesus'] own superiority to the questioner—and to any 'earthly' person', Meeks argues (1972:56). The metaphors of Johannine literature are thus 'irrational, disorganized, and incomplete' (1972:68). 'It is a book for insiders', he concludes (1972:70). At the same time, the metaphors were nevertheless fully comprehensible for insiders; they were a 'means of communication' (1972:68) for them. Thus, the social function of this enigmatic myth is exclusive and esoteric. Within the community structure, we do find a notion of unity, but this unity is limited to the relations 'God-Christ' and 'God-Christ-believers', according to Meeks. Therefore, the Gospel of John cannot

Nevertheless, existentialist interpretation may still be seen as a theological challenge (Baasland 1991:12).

⁴⁵ 'There can be no question, as Louis Martyn has shown, that the actual trauma of the Johannine community's separation from the synagogue and its continuing hostile relationships with the synagogue come clearly to expression here' (Meeks 1972:69). 'There is a broad consensus today that many aspects of the confrontation between Jesus and the Jewish authorities are projections into the narrative from the experience of the Johannine community' (Meeks 1985:95). Segal (1981) accepts Martyn's thesis too.

⁴⁶ Without linking this myth to the gnostic Redeemer myth, see Meeks (1967:104–105); Bultmann (1925; 1971:146ff); Moloney (1978:224ff, 247–256). Concerning the motif of Jesus as 'stranger', see also the collected articles by M. de Jonge (1977) and on alternative understandings of the historical background of the notion, e.g. Borgen (1977).

be a missionary tract, but deals with a crisis within the small group. Meeks (1972:70) argues that one of the primary functions of the book must have been to reinforce the community's social identity, that it 'provided a symbolic universe which gave religious legitimacy, a theodicy, to the group's actual isolation from the larger society'.

'Sect'-like solutions to the problem similar to the suggestions from Meeks have been asserted by German-speaking scholars like Käsemann, Leroy, Langbrandter, Onuki and Bull both before and after Meeks' 1972 article, but without the specific historical solutions of Bultmann and without Meeks' sociological stance. When Käsemann (1967:130) argues in favour of docetic assertions in the Gospel, he also claims that the community was a conventicle, i.e. a 'Konventikel mit gnostisierenden Tendenzen'.⁴⁷ Leroy (1968) examines 11 'places of misunderstanding' in the Gospel of John against the form and function of the riddle in antiquity; these places perhaps also indicate a social or practical dualism, according to Leroy. He argues in a similar vein to Käsemann that the dialogues in John present various misunderstandings that can best be explained as a special language ('Sondersprache') unintelligible to 'outsiders' and he suggests that the Gospel's *Sitz im Leben* is catechesis. Langbrandter (1977), too, argues that the kind of Christianity seen in the Fourth Gospel is determined by a gnostic dualism, referring to an a-sacramental group with a realised eschatology.⁴⁸ Onuki (1984:84) adheres to a sociological 'sect' theory by P. Berger (1954) to grasp the connection between the community's relationship to the outside world ('Ausserwelt') and its internal organisation that is based upon a charismatic order (cf. Jn 3:5). Although Onuki applies a sociological-like approach, his study does

⁴⁷ The ecclesiola had a 'Konventikelfrömmigkeit' that was forced upon the group by the criticism from the 'orthodox church', particularly evident in 3 Jn (Käsemann 1951:303). See also Käsemann (1967; 1969) and Langbrandter (1977).

⁴⁸ Langbrandter (1977:84ff) standing in the tradition from Bultmann, differs between the theology of the basic document ('Grundschrift') and the theology of redaction. Langbrandter (1977:115–116, n. 3) declares that he, in contrast with Käsemann, does not think the group was a conventicle. 'Historisch muss man sich das joh Christentum sicher als ein Gemeindeverband vorstellen, der wohl untereinander in engem Kontakt stand'. He is more in agreement with Cullmann, speaking of the Johannine Christianity as a part of early Christianity. This union ('Verband') is the historical background for the later redaction of the Gospel, according to Langbrandter.

not explicitly take sociological models into consideration as such. Onuki is particularly focused on the dualisms in the Johannine language and argues that there is a dynamic force in the relationship between the community ('Gemeinde') and the world. It is called to preach for the unbelieving world and to inner reflection in a continued circular movement (1984:218). Bull (1992) takes the manifold and ambivalent expressions in the Gospel concerning κόσμος and οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι as his point of departure and tries to explain the basic tension that the statements connected to these expressions exhibit. Partly based on source theories, he argues that the different layers of the Gospel reveal how the community proceeds in a process of integration and isolation from its environment (Bull 1992:240).⁴⁹ Although none of these scholars use sociological criticism according to my definition, they have added valuable insights and clarification often adopted in the sociological 'sect' debate on John; but my evaluation follows a different path.

Johannine scholars often affiliate to the sociological theories used by Meeks and his 'sectarian' definition of the Johannine community as a community with narrow boundaries. In his Johannine studies, Kysar (1992b:927) concludes that the Johannine community is 'sectarian' because 'they conceived of themselves as the possessors of the truth while all around them live in error', a feature evident from the dualistic language in the Gospel, 'light' against 'darkness'. A 'sectarian'-like claim was formulated in social scientific language by Neyrey (1988), where, with the help of social anthropological models, he argues that the high Christology of John became a code of revolt against the synagogue and against Christians who were considered to have inadequate faith. However, Neyrey (1988:117) also argues that Meeks' definition is elusive and that one needs a model that offers greater precision. Malina reaches similar conclusions in a later study (1994). Nevertheless, the impression of a consensus in these matters as Meeks claims is strengthened when looking at how scholars like Smith, Culpepper, Bogart, Segovia and Rensberger all lean on the perspective and conclusions of Meeks. 'In short, their perfectionist self-understanding, born of their peculiar eschatological perspective, contributed greatly to their sectarian self-understanding, to which Käsemann and Meeks refer', Bogart concludes (1977:139).

⁴⁹ See also Rebell (1989) and the bibliography in Moloney (1978:222–223).

Segovia (1981) presents the 'sectarianism' of John as a mere fact and quotes Meeks (1972), Smith (1974–1975), Culpepper (1975), and Bogart (1977) as supporting witnesses for this thesis. Segovia (1982: 204ff) compares his study of 'love' in the Gospel with the results from the 1972 article by Meeks against the background of sociological theories on 'sectarianism' of P. Berger (1954) and Wilson (1973). He concludes that his own study corroborates 'very strongly Meeks' conclusion' (Segovia 1982:205).⁵⁰ Rensberger (1988:27) even argues that 'it is the attitude toward Judaism and the outside world as a whole that seems most sectarian in John's gospel'.

Several scholars disagree both with the sociological method of 'sectarian'-based theories, the general perspective on John and the historical results. Cullmann, in his 'Der Johanneische Kreis' (1975:89), disagrees with Käsemann on the use of the designation 'sect' (or 'conventicle') in connection with the 'Johannine circle' and he wishes to see the 'circle' as something more than 'an element of syncretism'. In its developed form, Käsemann would like to call this circle a 'church', a 'particular school' or a 'Sondergruppe' within the overall church (1975:8).⁵¹ Brown (1979) opposes the conclusions of Meeks and refines the perspective while limiting his essential 'sect' question to the relationship between John and other Christians at the end of the first century. His task is to see if they had broken 'communion (koinonia) with most other Christians' (1979:15, 88ff). He also depicts several other 'groups' in the Gospel: 'Crypto-Christians' and Jewish Christians in addition to the group of possible non-believers, the world, the Jews and the adherents of John the Baptist (1979:59ff). Although he also discusses the relationship to the synagogue (1979:40ff), his interest in the sociological 'sectarian' perspective therefore takes a different direction than Meeks'. Brown finds that the community had 'not really become a sect', they were exclusive to most groups, but not to Apostolic Christians in the same degree (1979:90). He is

⁵⁰ Segovia (1982:212) also argues that 1 Jn represents a further 'sectarian' development in the history of the Johannine community. However, rather than being too categorical, he states that his understanding is 'one of the many empirical correlates that point in that direction' (1982:213).

⁵¹ The entire 'school' hypothesis may be seen as a similar phenomenon; compare with Hengel (1993:97–98) who argues for the existence of a school with a leader or teacher (using school dependent expressions like 'Gründer, Leiter, Schulhaupt' and 'Lehrer').

thus only in part able to discuss this issue with Meeks since Meeks is concerned with the community's relationship to its Jewish surroundings. Meeks (1972:71) does not limit the relationship with the world exclusively to Judaism, or as Brown—to other Christians. In Brown's investigation, neither the relationship towards the Greco-Roman world nor towards other Jewish groups are evaluated in detail.

The conclusions of Cullmann, Hengel, and Brown (and others leaning on similar theories) nevertheless point in another direction than Meeks' conclusions. Brown finds the Gospel to be both universal and missionary. Hence, the community cannot be 'sectarian' (1979:7). He further argues that Meeks is 'exaggerating the difficulty of Johannine literary artifices' (1979:61) and concludes that 'The negative then, does not dominate over the positive in the Fourth Gospel' (1979:62). He also rejects the theories of Bultmann and Käsemann that find gnostic or docetic sources in the Gospel of John. Like Meeks (1972), however, Brown (1979:24) assumes that the milieu around the Gospel may have *lead to* Gnosticism.⁵²

There have also been several other and more *severe* protests to Meeks' approach. K. Berger (1984:230) discusses Meeks' views in his introduction to modern New Testament exegesis. He rejects Meeks' results by pointing out that the observations can be better explained as an introduction to central Christian metaphors for inexperienced believers: 'Es handelt sich daher in keiner Weise um eine 'Projektion der sozialen Situation der Gruppe', sondern um eine *Einführung in die christliche Bildersprache*', K. Berger (1984) claims (cf. 1987:181–184). Passages like John 3:29; 11:11; 15:14–15 show that the Johannine community was more a community of friends (φίλοι) according to the ideals found in writings of ancient philosophical schools, K. Berger argues in agreement with Culpepper (1975); Barrett (1989); Hengel (1989b; 1993); Barton (1993) et al. He is also very sceptical in general of the use of isolated texts as symbolic key texts for an overall description, as Martyn, Meeks, and others tend to do (K. Berger 1977:230, n. 194) and in this case he would perhaps be more in compliance with Brown's (1979) holistic approach. In connection with

⁵² There are several general evaluations of the background of the Gospel, see for instance the contributions in Hoskyns (1947) on Judaism, Dodd (1953; 1963) on Greek culture and Braun (1966a; 1966b) on Qumran.

Meeks' understanding of the role of Nicodemus in Jn 3, a more sympathetic reading is certainly possible he says, as Brown (1979:72, n. 128) and Barton (1993:148) also argue.

The Norwegian scholar and bishop Ernst Baasland agrees with K. Berger and calls Meeks' analysis '*spekulativ*' (Baasland 1984:52). It is speculative, Baasland rightly argues, because Meeks relates two entities that are both unknown to us: the community, and its social background. This criticism may be seen as a variant of the general redaction-critical problem of circular arguments (i.e. the circularity of redaction and tradition, parts and the whole). To dissolve the circularity, external evidence is naturally recommended. One way to solve this problem is to compare the Gospel of John with other contemporary texts and argue by way of analogy—not to 'prove' a theory, but to say that one solution is more probable than the other.

Schnelle (1987; 1992) also places the Gospel within a Johannine school. In contrast to Brown, he even rejects that the Gospel was composed in reaction to other groups, Jewish or gnostic—the christological disagreements come from an earlier period in the history of the school, he contends (Schnelle 1987:257). He argues primarily against the viewpoints of Martyn and others with a similar perspective concerning the Gospel as bearing witness to Jewish Christianity in conflict with the synagogue. In this way, he also indirectly criticises a central point in Meeks' thesis. Nevertheless, he wants to read the Gospel in its present form as an expression of the author's intention (Schnelle 1987:49). As I see it, even earlier struggles must be taken as contemporary expressions of the author's attitudes as well as the attitudes of his audience and/or group.

In his analysis of the redundancy in the mythological language in the Gospel of John, Meeks also bases his study on a structuralist 'reader-response' matrix. This matrix has generally been criticised for its behaviourist approach. In addition to K. Berger (1984), scholars like Moore (1989), Barton, (1993:148) and Dokka (1995; 1999) have argued that the Johannine metaphors are self-explanatory. Dokka points to the fact that Meeks' thesis has a self-referential problem; when scholars explain the metaphors, they become 'members' of the 'sect' that used metaphors presumably unknown to 'outsiders'. One may, however, argue in favour of Meeks' thesis and say that his perspective belongs to the privilege of the analytical history writer.

When Neyrey (1988:117) partly supports Meeks and partly criticises him, he first of all disagrees on the choice of model. He sup-

ports Meeks by using a similar social scientific perspective and by arguing that there was a connection between social situation and mythical language in the making of the Gospel. Nevertheless, Neyrey contends that there are other models than the traditional 'sect' model that can better explain the particular Johannine situation. Therefore, he employs the 'group and grid' model from the social anthropologist Mary Douglas' 'Natural Symbols' (1966:77ff). He concludes that this model may be used to describe the progression of the Johannine community in stages.⁵³

Ashton (1991) is also positive about the way Meeks investigates the Johannine community as a result of the relationship between the community and the macro society.⁵⁴ He does not agree with Meeks in the details, he says (1991:110, 387, n. 29), but as far as I can see, he states nowhere which details he disagrees with and it is therefore difficult to discuss Ashton's position vis-à-vis the 'sect' theories. Kysar (1992b:98) wisely, I think, puts the notion in quotation marks when he points to 'the 'sectarian' quality of the self-perception of the community as set in opposition to the 'world'', referring to expressions in the Farewell Discourse (e.g. in Jn 16:3).

In both Meeks (1972) and Leroy (1968), there is an awareness of John's peculiar language.⁵⁵ Malina (1985; 1994) uses a similar socio-literary approach when he defines the language of the Gospel as an 'anti-language' (1985:13–14). In the commentary on John by Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998), the authors incorporate historical evaluations and comparisons of the Johannine language with the language in other New Testament writings. Applying theories from the sociolinguistics of Halliday, they focus on John's language as 'anti-language'

⁵³ That is, three stages in a progress reflecting 'the shift from initial faction formation to a program of reform of the system and finally to a revolt against the system' (Neyrey 1988:149).

⁵⁴ See also Ashton (1986:16) who calls Meeks' article the 'crown' of the collection, which is significant as the collection also consists of articles by Bultmann, Lamarche, de la Potterie, Borgen, Bornkamm, Martyn, and Dahl. 'Will there be other studies like this?', he asks.

⁵⁵ There are several examples of linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches to the Gospel. In addition to Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998); Petersen (1993), see also Onuki (1982; 1984); Olsson (1974; 1986), cf. the discussion in Petersen (1993:134–135). Onuki (1984:10) takes the sociological point of view: 'jeder religiöse Dualismus [ist] im Hinblick auf seine soziale Funktion mehr oder minder Theodizee'. He looks upon Meeks' article (1972) as a real forerunner for his own method ('in der wir einen echten Vorläufer für unsere Methode haben', Onuki 1984:10, n. 47).

and John's group as an 'anti-society'.⁵⁶ Similarly to Malina and Rohrbaugh, Petersen (1993:5) argues that 'the sons of Light' created an 'anti-language' in order to legitimate for themselves their identity as 'anti-society'. He uses a combination of literary, linguistic, and sociological perspectives and Petersen thus avoids the historical-critical perspective in its quest for the actual context. A general problem with studies limiting themselves to one particular writing in this way (above all seen in Petersen's study) is that social functions cannot be isolated from an evaluation of the context since all groups interact. The criticism of Baasland referred to above is also relevant for this procedure with its comparison of two unknown factors, the community and its environment (evident in the expression 'anti-society'). This is possible only in a pure literary procedure, which is also what Petersen (1993:2) aims at.

The notion of 'sect' as it is defined in the Troeltschian tradition, presupposes a church or an orthodoxy to which the 'sect' may oppose.⁵⁷ Therefore, Seland (1987) and Malina (1986; 1995) consider the term impracticable in relation to first century Christianity, mainly because of its anachronistic use of the notion 'church' as the background against which the 'sect' is defined. Together with Neyrey (1988) and Elliott (1995; 1998), they all make use of the notion of 'faction' as it is elaborated by J. Boissevain (1974), a social anthropologist,⁵⁸ finding this term more suitable, especially for the historical period of Jesus himself.

As stated above, Holmberg (1990) too argues that Bible criticism using a 'sectarian' model is methodologically flawed, that it is a

⁵⁶ Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998:7) define 'anti-language' according to the theories of Halliday from 1978, saying that it is the language of an 'anti-society' which is a society that is set up by another society as a conscious alternative to it, e.g. by using slang in a process of relexicalisation. See also Rohrbaugh (1998). There is a tendency in this theory towards an exclusive picture with some traditional 'sectarian' features involved, but the notions are also clearly more flexible than the traditional 'sect' model.

⁵⁷ Elliott (1998:277–278) argues that one should differ between M. Weber and Troeltsch at this point and locates the definition of the 'sect' as a group in a relationship to a 'church' to Troeltsch only. For an evaluation of M. Weber's typological method on early Judaism, see Talmon (1985).

⁵⁸ Boissevain (1974) describes various coalitions as 'cliques', 'gangs', action-sets', and 'factions'. A 'faction' is 'a coalition of persons (followers) recruited personally according to structurally diverse principles by or on behalf of a person in conflict with another person or persons, with whom they were formerly united, over honour and/or control over resources' (1974:192).

'rather doubtful instrument of analysis' as an explanatory model, and that it 'has a very low degree of discriminatory power'. It is methodologically flawed, he argues, because sociologists who constructed the category did so by using later Christian groups as material and the early church is then mirrored by the later church. It is a rather doubtful instrument because of the lack of precision in the construction of types, and an inherent tendency to static reification of the typology (Holmberg 1990:108–114). J. T. Sanders (1993:117–118) also points to the fact that since Troeltsch himself looked upon the 'sect' as dependent on the emergence of the Christian church, he would have been quite surprised to find out that what he looked upon as the beginning of 'church' was to be called a 'sect' (cf. Barrett 1989:99). Barton (1993:158–159) criticises the 'sect-church' typology because it 'is prone to being made captive to ideological interests of one kind or another', either of an anti-establishment ideology that takes the notion 'sect' as a term of appropriation, or of an 'establishment' ideology that uses the term to identify and marginalise the 'enemy'.⁵⁹ Actually, Barton himself presents the best argument against his political criticism of the notion, saying that the use of these models 'confronts us more clearly than is usually the case with the inevitable political nature of the act of interpretation'. Since biblical exegesis is not regarded as being an arbitrary activity, and since its political nature is inevitable, there is little we can do but state this political nature.

The criticism along these lines has been accurate when we consider the model itself and the way it has been applied. However, the *centrality of the temple in Jerusalem* for the Jewish people is interesting in a sociological perspective that focuses on deviance from a common tradition, instead of relations to common beliefs or an orthodoxy.⁶⁰ The criticism of the model has also been refuted for not being updated on the latest development of the 'sect' theories and

⁵⁹ Barton (1993:156) argues in a similar way against Esler's application (1987) of the 'sect' model to the Gospel of Luke, when Esler writes that the notion is both 'emic' or a native category (taken from the early development of the church), and an 'etic' or a scientific category. In this way, Barton argues that 'it is difficult to be sure that it is being used in the value-neutral, scientific way claimed'.

⁶⁰ The issue of orthodoxy or normative Judaism is well presented in the discussion between Aune (1976) and McEleney (1973; 1978). Although 'orthodoxy' is a difficult notion to describe this historical situation, there were doubtless some common ideas in Judaism at the time. Dunn (1991:18ff), too, speaks of four 'pillars': monotheism, the elected people (a covenant people with a promised land), covenant

models. Elliott (1995; 1998; 2001) argues that the latest cross-cultural 'sect' definitions from Wilson (e.g. 1990) make the model once again fruitful in the study of early Christianity. This new kind of 'sect' model shows the hostility of the 'sect' in terms of the world generally, and not in terms of a universal 'church'. Thus, it is no longer dependent on a particular Christian situation and avoids the problems of circularity. Elliott applies a modern and updated 'sect' model on the early church and finds that it very well explains the situation after Jesus' death. He sees a development from the Jesus group as a 'faction' to the first Christian groups being 'sects'. In so doing, the Christians developed strategies that are typical for a 'sect' according to Wilson's definitions, Elliott claims (cf. Esler 1994:13–15, and see chapter 2).

Elliott (1995; 1998; 2001) also discusses another and, from my point of view, interesting sociological model—the combined 'sect and cult' model from the American sociologists R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985). This notion of 'cult' was introduced precisely to discern different kinds of modern religious movements from the earlier notions of 'sects'. In short, in R. Stark and Bainbridge's terminology the 'cult' is the group that becomes a *new* religion, while the 'sect' proper wants to re-establish the old religion.⁶¹ In other words, the 'cult' presents new solutions while the 'sect' re-introduces and reinforces the old solutions.⁶² The 'cult' and the 'sect' both use some common and some contrary strategies to achieve their goals, but they should be held apart since their goals are of two clearly divergent kinds resulting in partly different sorts of social behaviour or practice. The dis-

focus in Torah and land focus in temple. They functioned as 'axiomatic convictions round which the more diverse interpretations and practices of the different groups within Judaism revolved' (1991:35). Craffert (2001) rejects the 'sect' model in principle and concludes that one should abandon it on attempting historical interpretation of the New Testament. One of his major criticisms is that the first century saw no normative parent body against which any group could be 'sectarian' (2001:46). However, the temple was an institution to which Jews could be 'sectarian' (see below).

⁶¹ The notion differs distinctively from the traditional theological and sociological use of 'cult' as worship or concerning the role of the Eucharist meal (O'Dea 1966:39ff).

⁶² The particular quest for the novelties of early Christianity has lately also been focused upon by Theissen (1999) who has studied Christian sign or symbolic language. He contends in connection with the Gospel of John that the Gospel is the climax in the process of 'how the new sign language detached itself step by step from Judaism' (1999:159) after the destruction of the temple.

tion introduced by this typology plays a central role in my evaluation of the alleged communities included in this investigation, John, Philo, and Qumran. Elliott rejects it, while I have found it most appropriate, as shall be demonstrated (Elliott's initiative to re-introduce the 'sect' model to the field is commendable and shall be further commented on in chapter 2). He uses perspectives also shared in my analysis, but he does not discuss the Johannine community in particular, and he does not make comparisons with other well-documented Jewish milieus of the time.

1.3.4 *Conclusions from the 'Sect' Debate*

The debate on 'sect' in studies of early Judaism and New Testament literature generally, as well as the criticism specifically concerned about the Gospel of John, presents a confusing and even contradictory picture. Initially, this modern understanding of the Gospel of John meets *several hermeneutic challenges* from a writing with exclusivistic traits. In addition, the review of scholarly opinions unveiled four areas that need to be further explored:

1. It shows the *lack of agreement* among biblical scholars concerning the apprehension and application of the notions in question characterising the Gospel.
2. It demonstrates that *several presumably different groups are all called 'sects'* (e.g. both the Johannine and the Qumran community).
3. It also presents a *great disagreement among scholars* on the basic social character of the Johannine community and on the usefulness of the notion 'sect' generally in historical-critical studies of the Bible in connection with their observations of the social characteristics. Therefore, when biblical scholars do apply similar definitions of the notions 'sect', their final judgements are not always congruous (e.g. Brown versus Meeks). The reason seems to be that in spite of a common definition of the notion, scholars have studied the interaction of the community with its social environments in different ways in order to measure its degree of isolation or segregation. We find discussions of its relationship to the 'world' in general, to gnostics, 'Jews', other Christians, Greeks, Romans, etc.
4. Several scholars (Baasland, Malina, Seland, Holmberg et al.) have rightly demonstrated that *the use of the traditional sociological 'sect' model by New Testament scholars has been flawed* in several ways.

They have shown that the results can only be used with care as a way of explanation of the origin and characteristics of the first Christians and their communities generally, if used at all.

However, even more important for my study is Elliott's conclusion concerning the developments in theories of sociologists dealing with new religious movements and that these are promising also for a description of the church in the first century. There are sociologists such as Wilson, R. Stark and Bainbridge that now treat the subject with new perspectives, and the usefulness of these new perspectives shall be further explored. Therefore, the report above of the discussion on the Johannine community and on the use of sociological models in this historical field not only describes the scholarly situation of Johannine studies today, *but also points forward*. Today's sociology of religion tries to understand the processes under which the relationship between different conflicting social groups emerges, such as between new religious movements and their parent body and between these groups and surroundings generally.

I shall argue that a broader comparative method of the past as well as insights from modern theories of the sociology of religion, still are helpful and may contribute to an adequate historical understanding of the Gospel of John today.

1.4 TWO 'TEST CASES' IN A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Was the Johannine community a 'sect'? Naturally, the answer to the 'sectarian' claim depends largely on the definition of the notion 'sect', a fact the presentation above fully demonstrates. Despite many differences, every definition of 'sect' is relational; a 'sect' is always 'sectarian' *in relation to* another defined social context. To properly characterise the Johannine community sociologically, we shall therefore have to locate essential relational entities. Preferably, these relations should be connected to issues of the texts that are not yet studied or, as in my case, employed the way I shall do. Ideally, too, in a study like this, all different aspects of the problem in focus, every social relationship of the community possible to be inferred from the Gospel of John should be analysed.⁶³

⁶³ For a more or less complete list of possible 'sectarian' features to be studied in such a way, see Elliott (1998:281–282).

Of the possible topics to be study in this connection I have focused on:

1. the attitudes towards the temple of Jerusalem or the temple institution (chapters 4, 5 and 6),
2. social relations seen particularly from a study of named 'others' or 'outsiders' (chapters 7 and 8) such as these attitudes may be elicited from certain passages in the Gospel as well as in the compared writings.⁶⁴

In a socio-redaction criticism approach, every aspect of the focused feature in the entire Gospel should be considered. Other aspects related to the temple and named 'others' should be examined as well, such as the attitude towards the synagogue, the 'Jews' and the 'world' in general, but to a lesser degree since quite a lot of research has been undertaken on these subjects already. The notions 'others' and 'outsiders' in this analysis are closely linked to the notion of 'group' (see chapter 3). I take 'others' to be a more general description of a group's external relationships than 'outsiders'.

These two foci establish a basis for comparison, and the comparisons with Philo and Qumran texts may be looked upon as 'test cases' (M. Douglas 1996:ch. 6).⁶⁵ Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, there were few possibilities to compare the emerging Christians with other Jewish groups. The discovery caused a complete shift, a new consensus of the Gospel's basic Jewish character emerged (Charlesworth 1996:66). The whole picture of temple Judaism is now changed (Dunn 1991:12; cf. 1992; 1996). With this discovery, we got an excellent opening for the kind of studies undertaken here. Moreover, the discovery of the radical influence of Greek elements and Hellenism on Judaism at the time also opens up for drawing

⁶⁴ 'Attitude' refers to a relatively stable system of beliefs concerning some object and resulting in an evaluation of that object. It includes opinion, affection, and action. Principally, all social phenomena become objects for an attitude (see Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1994:23; Korsnes, Andersen and Brante 1997:119–120). 'Attitude' refers to something more than an individual personality, but also to the probable general common way the groups in question approach an object, in casu the temple and 'outsiders'.

⁶⁵ Frühwald-König (1998) discusses much of the same matter as I do (Jn 2, 4, 5 and 7), but focuses on internal observations, a procedure that is difficult from a sociological point of view like the one undertaken here that aims at a general categorisation in modern terms.

Philo and the Jews in Alexandria into the investigation in like manner.⁶⁶ From these writings, I intend to derive a theory of the actual relationship to the temple and of social relationships in the alleged Johannine community.

1.5 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1.5.1 *Sociological Challenges to the Study of John*

The sociological perspective demands above all that a text is to be studied in relation to its surroundings in a reciprocal or dialectic way, i.e. *both* as a reflection of and a response to the social and cultural settings in which the text was produced (Elliott 1993:8). Meaning should be studied with that interaction in mind, i.e. meanings always derive from a social system as well as constituting it, today as well as for the author of John and his group (Malina and Neyrey 1996:ix; Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:2ff). The relationship of different groups of Jews in the first century towards the temple and ‘others’ may also be described sociologically as a ‘social construction of a reality’, to borrow an expression from P. Berger and Luckmann’s (1967) sociology of knowledge, a construction that is and was represented individually. An excellent way to grasp the essence of the objectivated social system in the Johannine community seems to be to contrast this social system with the social system in other Jewish texts from about the same time. What we actually do is to compare constructed pictures of these systems. An appropriate characterisation of the Johannine community should therefore be based on a comparison of central textual issues with similar issues in texts from other groups in order to ‘secure’ the result.⁶⁷ If the groups differ in a substantial way regarding the issues studied, this indicates that these groups must be labelled differently.

This procedure converges with the standard method and perspective in the history of religions (‘Religionsgeschichte’), i.e. the com-

⁶⁶ There is an almost complete consensus in this matter, see the groundbreaking studies of Hengel (1974a; 1974b; 1989a). Concerning the consensus on Hellenistic influence on Judaism, see Dunn (1991:9–10).

⁶⁷ For the arguments in favour of this procedure, see also Malina (1981). Meeks (1972) deliberately avoided external comparisons and evaluations of the genesis of the mythical language in John. Stibbe (1992:64) is quite right, I think, when he criticises the redaction criticism of Martyn and Malina that exclusively works within the confines of the gospel narrative itself.

parative phenomenology of religion. Such a comparison presupposes that there are similar and comparable issues or phenomena present in different texts to be analysed. Do we find central relational aspects of the alleged community behind the Gospel of John that may be compared to relational aspects in texts that originated in probably similar milieus? Such a question does not indicate a return to the 'religionsgeschichtliche' historical approach of genetical search evident in the works of Bultmann or Käsemann, but announces rather the need for external points of view from which we may evaluate the Gospel of John. Throughout the whole investigation, I shall argue that there are comparable phenomena in the relational aspects of temple and social relationships.

The combination of a social scientific, a historical, and a comparative approach makes this investigation distinct from most other Johannine studies on the social nature of the Johannine community and early Christianity. The comparison with the works of Philo certainly adds new perspectives to the testing of the 'sectarian' thesis concerning the background milieu of the Gospel of John.

1.5.2 *Eliciting Socio-Cultural Information*

It is not an easy task to elicit socio-cultural information as evidence for the sociological analysis from ancient written sources that are not intended by the originators to present such information. The three text-corpora in question here must be dealt with in different ways, according to our knowledge of their genre, addressee, and alleged purpose, in order to gain the information that is to be compared.

A fruitful and powerful perspective that is easily combined with a specific sociological standpoint is the two-level approach introduced by Martyn (1968; 1977; 1978; 1979). Variants of the method are central in any discussion of the possibility of eliciting socio-cultural information necessary in a sociological interpretation of the Gospel. Commentaries have long since noted that comments as 1:1–18; 2:22; 9:22; 20:30–31; 21 are indications of a later reworking of the entire passage in which they stand and reflect social processes behind the making of the Gospel.⁶⁸ As the Gospel thus obviously includes several post-resurrectional short comments there are in the Gospel two

⁶⁸ See Brown (1966:379ff; 1979:72); Martyn (1968; 1979:24ff); Barrett (1978:353ff); Schnackenburg (1971b:302).

specifically expressed general levels, but Martyn's thesis is even more far-reaching when he argues that the form of the stories told about Jesus reflects the history of the Johannine community on another level.

This particular method has several predecessors in the scholarly history of New Testament investigations,⁶⁹ and the general approach taken by Martyn seems to be a well-accepted thesis.⁷⁰ Martyn (1979:29, n. 22) himself sees a predecessor in Cullmann's thesis regarding Johannine expressions that have double meanings, but he focuses on the *dramatis personae*, e.g. the doubling of Jesus with an early Christian preacher (1979:27–30). Several scholars have employed a similar distinction and observed the mixed levels.⁷¹ Brown (1966:378) applies an analysis similar to that of Martyn as he presents John's contextualising of what he regards to be the tradition. Without using the term 'two-level drama analysis', he also finds that the discussions reflect a violent polemic between the disciples of Moses and the disciples of Jesus in the late first century (1966:379). The 'Pharisees'

⁶⁹ Mussner (1965) introduced the German notion 'Johanneische Sehweise' (Johannine perspective) in order to describe the evangelist's hermeneutic position: John merges the horizons of the historical Jesus and the post-Easter reality, see the introduction to recent German contributions to this approach by Scholtissek (cf. 1998:246ff). Both Onuki (1984) and Mussner (1965) use Gadamer's theory concerning 'Horizontverschmelzung' to describe this perspective. Onuki misuses Gadamer here since Gadamer's solution is a solution based upon a modern, historical approach—as Ashton argues (1991:438). See also further down on Dahl's approach (1962).

⁷⁰ See also the support of this view on the background in Barrett (1978:93, n. 1). Borgen (1991) and Ashton (1991:107ff) support the method in general as well as Menken (1993:296–297). Its general acceptance is also demonstrated by the fact that it is applied to several Johannine passages, see the use of it in de Boer's (1996:7), who declares his enthusiasm for the approach. M. de Jonge (2000) criticises several recent attempts of reconstructing the history of the community as basis for christological studies (including de Boer's study), but restates his support to the existence of a community.

⁷¹ Léon-Dufour (1951:156) employs 'les auditeurs de Jésus' on the one hand and 'les lecteurs de Jean' on the other. Guilding (1960:4) argues that 'time' for the evangelist is both 'historic time' and 'lectionary time'. Dahl (1962:125–126) uses the same perspective by introducing the terms, 'the time of the church' and 'the time of Jesus'. The formula of Jn 4:23 'the hour comes and is now' is by Dahl taken to visualise the relation between the 'time' of the earthly ministry and the 'time' of the church, and 'in spite of the temporal distance there is an essential identity' (Dahl 1962:128). The situation of the post-resurrection church is claimed to be 'prefigured and anticipated during the earthly ministry of Jesus in Israel' (1962:127). Theissen (1999:186ff) speaks of a deliberate 'hermeneutics-in-stages' in the Gospel to explain the particular blend of history and theology (past and present) in the writing.

are looked upon as the logical descendants, the opponents of John; the 'we' on the lips of the former blind man is the voice of the Christian apologists (1966:380). In his commentary on the passion narratives, Brown (1994) applies the Johannine example of two levels as a key to interpretations of all the gospels.⁷² Meeks (1985:94) also thinks that the passages containing the word ἀποσυνάγωγος (Jn 9:22; 12:42; 16:2) reflect an ongoing conflict between the community and the synagogue (cf. 19:38; 20:19). Against this background, there is little wonder that Moody Smith concludes that the approach initiated by Martyn is now 'one of the more securely established results of Gospel research' (Smith 2000:12). Likewise, Ashton calls this approach 'probably the most important single work on the Gospel since Bultmann's commentary' (Ashton 1991:107). Brown (1979) employs the two-level analysis rather boldly and finds several levels in the text corresponding to the history of the community not initially described by Martyn.

There is of course nothing like a consensus in these matters. In chapter 3, I shall discuss some of the details in Martyn's reading of the expulsion from the synagogue. In this section, some questions concerning the general approach shall be evaluated. Schnelle (1987:36) questions all literary reconstruction,⁷³ and advocates the importance of reading the Gospel as it now stands, since there can be no literary or theological reasons for a reordering of the text as Bultmann and others argued (Schnelle 1987:18). Schnelle concludes that redaction criticism is, in fact, the only possible method today in the study of John (1987:49ff). He rejects that the literary source-analysis, the hypothesis about several literary layers and their theological tendencies,⁷⁴ or the approach based on precise external historical

⁷² Brown (1994:13, n. 14) refers to the expulsion from the local synagogue (9:22; 12:42; 16:2), the organisation of the Jesus tradition as testimony or witness to respond to questioning (1:19–27; 5:16–47), and the intention of the evangelist to communicate to their audiences an interpretation of Jesus that would nourish faith and life (stated explicitly in 20:31).

⁷³ A similar criticism is presented by M. de Jonge (2000). I think Schnelle is mostly right, but although there may be no acute crisis with contemporary Judaism, a conflict with a local synagogue is highly probable not long before the composition of the text. What Fortna (1970b) argued was that there might have been a connection between the development of the Gospel as suggested by Martyn and the literary development—a theory that is much more likely than a development on pure ideological reasons so often presupposed in earlier source theories.

⁷⁴ Referring to scholars like Fortna (e.g. 1970b); Brown (e.g. 1966); Langbrandtner

information (Martyn), alone are capable of solving the Johannine problem. Although Schnelle (1987:85) is, as stated above, critical to see the Gospel against a present conflict with the dominating version of Judaism, he nevertheless supports the approach of seeing the Gospel of John as an aetiology of the Johannine group. This is the core principle of method in Meeks' article (1972), but he supports the procedure only in a strict sense, i.e. only in light of the stated theological and christological criteria in Jn 20:30–31 (i.e. the question of production or confirmation of the Christian faith). Though hypothetical, it is nevertheless a probable one and therefore also the basis for my investigation.⁷⁵

In addition, scholars have pointed out that there are other methodological problems in reading the biblical texts as a mirror of the social situation behind it or as a detailed and encoded history of the community. It is almost impossible to know whether there is a symmetry or asymmetry between symbol and social reality (Holmberg 1990:134–137) or whether the relationship between belief and social structure is causative, dialectical, or symmetrical in our quest for the social location of thoughts (Rohrbaugh 1987:103).

'Mirror-reading' of the Gospel of John is a way of investigation that is wide open for mistakes due to our lack of direct information or personal contact with the persons, milieus and surroundings behind the texts, information that may demonstrate the inherent values and meanings.⁷⁶ Barton (1993:148) warns against the reading of the Gospel as a cipher for history and sociology of the Johannine community and questions the reading of the gospel narrative as a kind of allegory of the Johannine community because it 'runs too great a risk of finding what is not there or what, by nature of the evidence, cannot be found'. In a collection of several articles against the claim that the gospels were written for specific churches, Bauckham (1998:1ff)

(e.g. 1977); Thyen (e.g. 1977); Richter (e.g. 1977), criticising those who combine the search for sources and layers with a search for editions and a basic document or sign source. The contributions to theories of the sign source are still prosperous (Scholtissek 1998:228).

⁷⁵ Carson (1991:87) discusses Martyn's theses in the introduction under 'The Purpose of the Gospel' and rightly underscores its hypothetical character. The supposition is supported by Wengst (1981:52) and Thyen (1980) and Frühwald-König (1998), but is disputed by Schnelle (1987:39ff) and Rahner (1998).

⁷⁶ Martyn's two-level analysis of the Gospel of John is a typical mirror reading, see Motyer (1997:24ff). This criticism is similar to the criticism by Baasland (1984) referred to above on the speculative character of the approach.

and especially Barton (1998) argue again that the sociological reading has become allegorical, i.e. without historical basis. Bauckham and the other critics in this edition therefore suggest a literal reading of the Gospel, an approach which according to Barton (1998:179) will 'lessen the danger, . . . , of distracting attention away from the text towards what the ingenious scholar can show lies behind or beneath the text'. Similarly too, Motyer (1997:24ff) attacks the two-level 'mirror-reading' for being allegorical and suggests a narrative criticism that takes into account the historical questions concerning sources and community. Motyer (1997:32ff) leans on narrative theories like that of Stibbe (1992), but Stibbe (1992:54) himself concluded that it is 'crucial to adapt and incorporate the sociological bias of form and redaction criticism', a position not far removed from mirror-reading.⁷⁷ Hägerland (2003) uses the lack of ancient parallels as one of his arguments against the two-level drama hypothesis (2003:316), an argument that I think fails to acknowledge the uniqueness of the Johannine situation indicated above all by the particularities of the Gospel compared to the Synoptics. This and similar criticisms also lack a discussion of alternative solutions and of the redaction-critical method generally. It can not, for instance, be an argument against this kind of mirror-reading that the Gospel itself does not exhibit any desire to present a history of the Johannine community, as Hägerland says (2003:321).⁷⁸

One of the basic presuppositions in redaction criticism is to see a gospel as a conscious revision and composition (K. Berger 1984:202). This perspective corresponds to the presupposition in sociological exegesis that texts must be looked upon as units of meaningful social discourse (Elliott 1993:49), as well as in the conviction that there are ways to secure the process towards a proper reading.⁷⁹ It is not

⁷⁷ Literary critics often attack redaction criticism for using the Gospel as a 'window' to the history of the community, see Culpepper (1987:3–4) and Stibbe (1992:50–54). Interestingly, in some hermeneutic theories of the Bible, allegory is regarded as unavoidable since exegesis always includes eisegesis, see Young (1993:108) and my discussion below. As I see it, mirror-reading should not be called allegorical as long as the interpreter finds that the text presents redactional remarks and finds anomalies directly or indirectly. This is a principle that is in accordance with common redaction criticism.

⁷⁸ See also my discussion in chapter 3 about the passages with the notion ἀποσυνάγωγος.

⁷⁹ Cf. K. Berger (1984; 1987) concerning redaction criticism and sociological questions, and Elliott (1993) concerning social scientific criticism. My investigation is of

possible from a purely narrative point of view to accept the total rejection of the redaction criticism adapted in this study without rejecting the entire historical project, since there is no such thing as asocial persons, in past or present.⁸⁰ To plead that a narrative and completely ahistorical reading is the only possible way of reading the New Testament, adds little to the discussion within the historical-critical perspective. To claim that the approach is allegorical in principle and must lead to over-interpretation is also a rather simple contention. Some of the investigations into the concrete background of the Gospel of John may have been over-optimistic and the detailed analysis of the Gospel text as direct witness to the community is difficult.⁸¹ Naturally, one must always read such earlier results critically. Nevertheless, when some aspects of a text are unexpected from a narrative perspective, non-literary explanations become plausible. The focus in my study is historical by choice aiming to answer the question: what was possibly the most *radical* attitude of the alleged community towards the temple and ‘others’ or ‘outsiders’ compared to other groups at the time? The approach adopted in my investigation is therefore exactly a *critical* ‘mirror-reading’.

Theissen (1988b) elaborated three different and principle ways for accumulating information to be used in his sociological analysis of the Jesus movement. I shall use similar principles in my historical reconstruction and ‘mirror-reading’ of the Johannine movement. Theissen operates with the notions ‘constructive, analytical and comparative conclusions’.⁸²

course not an attempt to build an overall theory of the relationship between texts and society, see the discussion in Robbins (1996b:6ff).

⁸⁰ Stibbe (1992:66–67), argues against the pure literary approach of scholars like Culpepper. Smith (2000:12–13) rightly concludes that the Gospel of John must be seen not only against its social background in the perspective introduced by Martyn, but also that the literary study analysing the gospel’s sources and redaction is necessary as well as a more holistic view argued by Bauckham and others, in what Smith calls its function as ‘scripture’. This cannot mean, of course, that one has to study the Gospel using all these perspectives at the same time. I find myself often in agreement with Robbins (1996a; 1996b) and the socio-rhetoric perspective on texts that compares texts on a literary level, but I am also interested in the question of historicity on the level of the community.

⁸¹ Stibbe (1992:65) adheres to Meeks and Malina rather than Martyn and Brown in his study of the social function of John’s narrative (Jn 18–19).

⁸² ‘Konstruktive, analytische und vergleichende Rückschlussverfahren’ (Theissen 1988b:11). The list is derived from Theissen (1988a:3) with some clarifications (*italics mine*).

1. 'Constructive conclusions' are drawn from an evaluation of pre-scientific sociological statements, which give either *prosopographic* information about origin, property and status of individuals, or *sociographic* information concerning programme, organisation and patterns of behaviour of whole groups.
2. 'Analytical conclusions' are drawn from the texts that afford an *indirect* approach to sociological information. Illuminating in this respect are statements about recurring events, conflicts between groups or conflicts over ethical and legal norms, literary forms and poetic modes of expressions (e.g. parables).
3. 'Comparative conclusions' are generated from *analogous* movements to be found other places at that time. The more widespread a pattern of behaviour was in Palestinian Jewish society, the more we may assume that it was socially conditioned. We must therefore pay special attention to the other renewal movements within Jewish society that can be found alongside the Jesus movement.

The first notion is the more secure one. Recurrent events and patterns of behaviour are, nevertheless, of special importance, and from these initial conclusions other and more general conclusions may be reached. It is of vital importance that a sociological exegesis is able not only to differ between these paths to conclusion, but also to relate the nature of the final conclusions to the nature of the initial conclusions. As pointed out, Theissen's approach has been criticised for being based upon too simple a one-to-one correspondence between a text and the underlying social situation (e.g. Holmberg 1990:123). There are, however, ways of securing the reading, and traditional historical criticism has elaborated procedures to avoid naive eisegesis or arbitrary allegory.⁸³ Elliott (1993:72–75) proposes detailed questions leading to possible secure ways of sociologically reconstructing the past (see also Kee 1989:65ff). Such strategies will be supplied here with the two-level analysis and common redaction-critical methods that include both literary and form-critical procedures. Sociological criticism of the Bible is not an alternative that outrules other exegetical approaches but is inseparably related to

⁸³ Typically, contemporary biblical scholars who are criticising the traditional historical-critical method with its emphasis on the intention of the author, still expect it to play a major role in future biblical interpretation, see Watson (1993:5).

them (Elliott 1993:7).⁸⁴ According to standard redaction-critical principles (Schnelle 1987:85) one should describe what one considers to be the tradition as well as the reworking of this tradition by the editor or an evangelist, in addition to describing the total redactional concept that governed this process. The traditional material taken over by the author or redactor in his community can hardly be looked upon as in opposition to the redaction, unless we have direct textual evidence to the contrary.⁸⁵ Both the history of the material and the final editing and interpretation are therefore to be investigated. From my point of view, the conflict with a synagogue is still a valid argument and basis for seeing the Gospel as reflecting the community and its life-setting (see chapter 3). The distinction between three different approaches in Theissen's procedure, in fact, reflects an awareness of these methodological fallacies. The analytical conclusions must not be confused with the constructive ones and the comparative conclusions represent the external source that challenges the historical probabilities of the first two conclusions.⁸⁶ In so doing, we may limit the range of social experience and reality that a position implies and we may then infer the most probable solution by far also concerning the process by which that position came to be occupied (see Rohrbaugh 1987:115).

1.5.3 *The Use of Models in Biblical Investigations*

The main methodological issue at stake in social scientific biblical criticism is the conscious use of models (Horrell 1999:10). Since every approach to this field includes pre-conceived theories, a conscious use of modern models should be a natural part of the enterprise (Elliott 1986:5–6; Horrell 1999; Craffert 2001:22). Nevertheless, the use of

⁸⁴ Olsson (1995) questions Elliott's lack of interest in text-theories (particularly in 1995:844–845) and suggests that the social scientific method must be elaborated with insights from rhetorical analysis.

⁸⁵ Brodie (1993:21) too easily rejects the attempt at tracing the history of a Johannine community. He argues that what is needed is a source-oriented approach. In one way, he is right when he argues that there is too little evidence and thus few historical controls for the reconstruction, but 'scholarly fancy' cannot be used as an argument against the approach per se.

⁸⁶ Motyer (1997:33–34) is quite right in pursuing the quest for appropriate external indicators in a broad contextual reading. It is exactly the same procedure that must be adopted in the extensive use of modern concepts that models the sociological criticism.

fixed models applied deductively is admittedly more dangerous from a methodological point of view since 'using a theory' is not necessarily the same as using a fixed model and therefore special precautions have to be made.

There are several understandings of exactly what a model is and how it functions in a historical investigation. One may say that a model is a simplification of the reality that may improve our understanding, but a model is also more than a metaphor as it is constructed in order to serve as an instrument of interpretation (Elliott 1993:41).⁸⁷ Another way of defining a model is to focus on its functions. In sociological literature, the functions of models in a sociological investigation are said to be of three explanatory kinds, summarising, hypothetical, and illustrative.⁸⁸ Models may help us to construct appropriate questions to the texts. By giving us appropriate questions sociological method helps us to be informed about the regularities of ancient social and cultural life and in this way we may also gain a clearer understanding of the text. It is a heuristic device, i.e. employed as a 'vehicle for discoveries' (Elliott 1993:15, 44).⁸⁹

Exactly how models may help our understanding of specific texts from the past is less obvious at the outset. The major problem in using sociological models deductively in historical investigations is their inevitable *modern* touch that may cause anachronisms or incongruent subjects when applying them to ancient times and texts, as modern culture is obviously different from ancient culture. At least, we cannot presume it otherwise and there is always a danger of forcing the material into an arbitrary, imposed pattern (Kee 1989:61). It might be that models taken from the area of the Circum-Mediterranean and Near Eastern culture (Elliott 1993:49) are better suited to explain many issues in the New Testament, a writing coming from the same area, but no model is really capable of overcoming

⁸⁷ Malina (1982:231) defines it as 'an abstract, simplified representation of some real world object, event, or interaction constructed for the purpose of understanding, control, or precision'. It may be described as an analogy, a metaphor, or a guide to thought (Flanagan 1991:215). 'Type' and 'model' may denote specific categories involving explanations claiming some sort of general value. De Vos (1999) argues in the same way in relation to his study of conflicts in Pauline communities: every explanation needs a model.

⁸⁸ Engelstad, Grenness, Kalleberg et al. (1996), cf. Elliott (1986, 1993:41ff).

⁸⁹ See also Holmberg (1990:15, 140ff) and Rohrbaugh (1987). These scholars also argue in favour of the heuristic function.

this gap between cultures and times. Even Mediterranean mentality and social system today are not necessarily the mentality and the social system in the area two thousand years ago (Horrell 1999). The 'incommensurability' is theoretically absolute and we can never be sure when we apply even these models as ways to understanding the past.⁹⁰ This should not hinder us, however, from searching the background, characteristics, and explanations, as long as we are aware of the theoretical and practical difficulties of the task, and are able to implement them in the final evaluations and incorporate them into the conclusions.⁹¹

A part of the problem in using modern models is the affinity of sociology and social anthropology towards general explanations or forms of interaction. Nonetheless, the traditional picture of sociology as a generalising intellectual activity on the one side and historiography as seeking the particular on the other, cannot be upheld (Burke 1992). Since every historian needs generalised notions, the main question is rather how fruitful it is in each case to work deductively from a single particular one.⁹² One way to operationalise cautions is to define some sort of 'falsification' test. Historical scholars working deductively in a conscious way should always be able to tell when and under what conditions they consider a model, theory, or hypothesis to be disconfirmed (Elliott 1993:61). One way of avoiding improper deductive use of models in historical explanations is therefore

⁹⁰ On the problem of incommensurability, see e.g. Garrett (1992:93). Holmberg (1990:139) criticises the assumption in the sociological interpretation that presumes that there is such a thing as a cross-cultural commensurability. Seland (1992) supports those who argue for the necessity of using modern social anthropological models derived from the eastern Mediterranean world when interpreting the Bible. Moxnes (1994b:156) refers to a common objection against the use of modern social anthropological models from Mediterranean countries to explain the first century world; we have in fact little knowledge on what kind of impact institutionalised religions like the Catholic church and Islam have had on these cultures during the past two thousand years, cf. the comments on the 'Context Group' in Horrell (1999:21ff).

⁹¹ See Stanton's first 'safeguard' for New Testament interpretations: 'the interpreter who is aware of the danger is more likely to avoid it [the presupposition] than one who is not' (1985:68).

⁹² General models of explanation in natural science have some similarities to the description of universal laws of nature and covering laws. If we transport such an understanding of a model to the study of man, it causes serious problems since causal explanations in human historiography cannot be looked upon as based on deductions from universal laws of social nature. Social locations of thoughts are heuristic constructs, not explanatory ones (Rohrbaugh 1987:115).

to develop a kind of a priori test criteria. In any discussion of model, some kind of test criteria should be introduced to avoid a one-sidedness accompanied by the search for verifications of the one model only. Testing of models can no longer be seen as optional (Craffert 2001:24). Basing the investigation on ancient texts, one should therefore ask what kind of textual evidence one considers necessary in order *not* to categorise a group within a particular type of model. This procedure relates to an established procedure in sociological criticism of the Bible with a combination of a social description and sociological explanation based on modern models.

The distinction applied in biblical scholarship between the socio-historical or socio-political approach, social science criticism, and sociological criticism is not always clear (Horrell 1999). The reason for this unclear situation is, not surprisingly, different definitions. Elliott defines social scientific criticism very well as 'a merger of exegesis and historical research with the resources of the social sciences' (2001:7), a definition that includes social anthropological studies and other approaches in addition to the traditional sociological ones. I follow the procedure of several scholars who also distinguish between 'sociology' and 'social science' taking the latter to be a more general notion while 'social-history' describes the analyses that do not refer to general explanations. A 'socio-historical' approach is often seen as a mere description of a historical situation, primarily by taking over the terms from the historical actors themselves. 'Sociology' has, however, both broad and narrow definitions and only in the narrow sense is it possible to discern 'sociological exegesis' as 'socio-historical'.⁹³ My procedure may be looked upon as a combination of a socio-historical and a socio-redactional approach, although in one way, social scientific approaches always imply a socio-historical perspective. First, I want to start by consulting perspectives from

⁹³ Holmberg (1990:12) defines sociology as a predictive science asking for the final general cause and social sciences as retrodictive, asking for social meaning. Best (1983:185) argues that there are two levels in sociological studies: the level of description and the level of explanation, and only the latter is a 'true' sociological approach. Elliott (1993:12) explains this difference by saying that the 'socio-historical' approach answers the 'that'- and 'what'-questions and the difference is one of degree, not kind (see also Elliott 1986:9). In accordance with these definitions, Moxnes (1988c:159) distinguishes between three groups of New Testament scholars: 'social historians', historians who use a wide range of perspectives from sociology and anthropology, and scholars who take social science theories and models as their starting point. Cf. the discussion in Horrell (1999).

modern sociological models. Secondly, I shall study the texts and compare the results of the exegesis of John with other contemporary Jewish writings, and then at last, apply the result to the insights gained by the models.⁹⁴

Esler (1994:4ff) discusses the use of models in historical New Testament exegesis and points to a couple of principles that are essential to the use of models. He criticises a theory that Garrett (1992) calls an 'interpretive approach'. Garrett's theory is formulated in opposition to the pure model-oriented approach that does not care too much about the presumptions in question. This 'interpretive method' is said to be a more adequate treatment of the problem of how one can translate the discourse or social script of one culture into another, since this approach lies closer to the native's point of view. Esler criticises this method because of its 'post-modern' assumptions, meaning that at the end the historical researcher will not be able to adopt to the outward (*etic*) approach typical for modern social anthropologists. I, for one, would use the notion 'abduction' to describe the process of comparing textual evidence with models, i.e. the conscious movement or dialogue between the stated presupposition (models) and the text-analysis.⁹⁵

The use of models may be of good help in identifying various factors accompanying the Johannine movement and as a *heuristic* device, it must be judged by its results. If it adds historical insights and thereby renders the texts more comprehensible to us in our situation, the method has proven its fruitfulness. By declaring that the main purpose of using models is heuristic, the historical-critical perspective with its focus on the 'author' (in a wide sense) is maintained, and it therefore contrasts with the pure post-modern or a complete ahistorical methods within a literary 'paradigm'. At the same time, it affirms the idea that the interpreter, too, is historically situated (see Watson 1993:4–5). This is not to say that every historical investigation must start by presenting their model(s). Within a specific tradition or milieu where the presumptions are made explicit, the explicit

⁹⁴ Social anthropology uses the distinction between *emic* and *etic* notions that may help us to see how these approaches may be combined, see Elliott (1993:38–39); Feleppa (1986); Garrett (1992).

⁹⁵ The notion of 'abduction' is used by C. S. Peirce to describe such an 'interpretive' method or logic different from deduction and induction. 'Retroduction' is another name for the same procedure, see Malina (1991); Malina and Neyrey (1996:ix); Elliott (1993:48–49).

use of models should not be necessary every time a scholar writes on a subject.

1.6 PLAN FOR PROCEDURE

In *chapter 2*, alternative sociological models are presented and later discussed in connection with the textual analysis. *Chapter 3* discusses the crucial matter of the existence of the Johannine community. In order to make a firm ground for the comparison, the historicity of Philo and Qumran communities are discussed and compared to the Johannine evidence. I shall conclude that the meaning of the notion differs from the one text to the other but not in such a way that they are incomparable.

Chapters 4–6 analyses temple statements and the possible attitudes and relationships followed by such attitudes found in John, Philo, and Qumran. In *chapter 4*, I shall analyse the story of the so-called ‘temple cleansing’ (Jn 2) in which I focus upon the assumed troubled relationship of Jesus and the community towards temple Judaism and I will combine the results of this analysis with the results of a study on Jn 4. *Chapter 5* compares the results of the previous investigation in John to relevant texts in Philo, particularly denoting his ambivalent attitude towards the holy place; I also follow the same procedure with some of the Qumran texts. *Chapter 6* evaluates the other temple and festival passages in John to see if these may shed light on the temple relationship of the community when compared to the insights gained from the preceding analysis of Philo and Qumran. In *chapter 7 and 8*, I shall study and compare aspects of social relationships in John, Philo, and Qumran.

The main conclusions of my investigation in relation to the sociological models are drawn in *chapter 9*. First, the hypothetical character of the existence of a particular Johannine community must be underlined while stating that the final conclusions always must take this hypothetical character as well as the paucity of information into consideration. Second, I shall conclude that the differences between these texts (John, Philo, and Qumran) indicate that the alleged groups behind them must be categorised in different ways as far as the studied issues in this investigation are concerned. A central part of my conclusion is that these communities represent three different kinds of groups or sociological types, and that the Johannine community is *not* ‘sectarian’.

CHAPTER TWO

MODELS AND QUESTIONS

2.1 THE 'SECT', A CONCEPT WITH CHANGING MEANINGS

'Sect' may be used to refer to a group in a simple sense (S. Cohen 1987; Schiffman 1995). In so doing, scholars follow the modern derivations of the notions φιλοσοφία and αἵρεσις, originally referring to an ancient Greek or Roman (philosophical) school with teacher and students, or to a group generally, words often translated as 'sect' in English translations of the writings of Josephus, Philo and the NT.¹

However, the modern sociological meaning of the word 'sect' has, as stated above, been much more specific and substantial, referring to some kind of a deviant, separatist or segregated group, often with negative connotations. The traditional 'sect' typology in sociology has also been steadily altered and accustomed to new empirical insights since its early start by M. Weber and Troeltsch (see e.g. Pope 1942:117ff; O'Dea 1966:66ff; Johnson 1971:124). When presenting the typology in the previous chapter, I concluded that the main reason for the negative judgement by several biblical scholars was the fact that Troeltsch and H. Niebuhr developed the 'sect' type in correlation to a 'church'-type, which means that without a Christian 'church', there is no 'sect'. Applying it to a pre-Christian scene seems to be sheer nonsense. However, it is far from correct to say that

¹ Josephus used the notion αἵρεσις to present different directions among 'Jews', linking its meaning to the verb αἰρέομαι ('choose for oneself') and without any connotation to further social characteristics of the notion. Thackeray's (1926) edition of Josephus translates the word with 'sect' in Vita 10, while he uses 'school' in Bell. 2:162. In the Latin translation by Haverkamp and Hudson (Josephus 1782–1785), 'secta' is used to denote both φιλοσοφία and αἵρεσις within the same passage. In Philo's Contempl. 29, the notion αἵρεσις is used about the Egyptian (Jewish) Therapeutae and translated with 'sect' by Yonge (1993:700) and 'secte' in the French edition by Daumas and Miquel (1963:99). In English translations of the NT, 'sect' is a common translation of αἵρεσις in Acts, see NRSV (1993) of Acts 15:5; 24:5, 14; 26:5; 28:22. On the connection between Josephus; modern translation and the meaning of the notion, see also Barrett (1989); J. T. Sanders (1993:124).

sociologists only have defined 'sect' in relation to the 'church'. In Marxist sociology, the 'sectarian' protest is explained as a result of an ongoing class struggle in societies within which the class conflict is not yet conscious. Non-Marxists may argue in a similar vein that the origin of 'sects' leads 'not into the arena of class struggle, but towards other causes of social division and human disaffection' (W. Stark 1967:6).

M. Weber, in his quest for the ideal 'sect' type, was in fact aware of the anachronistic fallacy and used the concept in a broad way. Thus, he regarded the groups of Pharisees and Essenes as proofs of a social exclusiveness typical in any 'sect' and pointed to similar features among the followers of Jesus. He also speaks of Muslim 'sects' (M. Weber 1993:265). Nevertheless, the term has been particularly attached to the development of the later Christian church. Admittedly, it is difficult to use a term so attached to the later development of the Christian church on the period of its formation. At the same time, sociologists of religion have also argued that the model is now out of date for a description of the many new religious groups that are emerging today, and claim that its wide range of meanings is too confusing for their purpose (Garrett 1992:181; Bainbridge 1997:24). Sociologists who apply it are scholars like Wilson (1990) and R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985). One who has come to abjure the notion, is M. Douglas (1996) where she argues that the term has now become 'a term of reproach or even of contempt applied by members of the Church to dissenters' and therefore 'should be ruled out of the discourse' (1996:xix). The negative connotation that the notion 'sect' carries is generally recognised.² Some more glimpses of the history of the model may help to evaluate its usefulness to biblical interpretation.

Troeltsch followed the tradition of M. Weber applying the typology to later historical periods and in 1911 defined a 'sect' as a religious protest against established religion and against secular society. The 'church' on the other hand, tends to adjust to the larger secular society, he argued.³ In 1929, H. Niebuhr adopted the theory on

² Elliott (1998:274) refers to the development towards what he calls a *sensu malo* of the notion as early as by Ignatius and Justin. See Bainbridge (1997:23) and Hemminger (1995) and the discussion in my chapter 1 in regard to Barton (1993:158–159).

³ See Troeltsch (1981); H. Niebuhr (1957). Troeltsch's article 'The Social Teaching

North American conditions (a situation without the dominating state-church concept) and developed yet another type of religious group-concept that represents a midpoint in the continuum between 'sect and church', i.e. the 'denomination', whose primary sources were sought in the European history of the churches that emigrated to America.⁴ The denomination is the independent church, typical for the situation in North America, a result of a social fragmentation that H. Niebuhr himself regretted. H. Niebuhr and Troeltsch together delineated at least 11 characteristics of a 'sect' and the same number for the definition of 'church'. Yinger (1970:257) later reduced the 'sect' characteristics to three features:

1. The degree to which the membership policy of the group is exclusive and selective (= 'sect') or open and inclusive,
2. the extent to which the group accepts or rejects (= 'sect') the secular values and structures of society, and
3. the extent to which, as an organisation, the group integrates a number of local units into one national structure, develops professional staffs, and creates a bureaucracy or not (= 'sect').

Other sociologists have since developed the 'sect' model into a cross-cultural comparison of 'foreign' cultures, thus making it more useful as a general or 'ideal' way of interpreting historical 'foreign' events, too. Above all, one may observe a further development towards a simplification of the model, already seen in Yinger's work. Roberts (1990:181ff) describes this process from multi-dimensional definitions of the concept to a simpler definition. He points out that nowadays there seems to be a consensus that 'sect and church'-concepts should each be identified with no more than three factors and perhaps with only one. In his judgement, however, there is no consensus on whether that one factor should be in conflict with the dominant society or the extent of institutionalisation (Roberts 1990:191).

Accordingly, Johnson (1963:542; 1971) defines the 'church' as a religious group that accepts the social environment in which it exists,

of the Christian Churches' (first published in 1911 as 'Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen') is reprinted in Gill (1996:56–68). See also the use of Troeltsch in Barrett (1989:99–100).

⁴ H. Niebuhr's article was first published in 1929 and was titled 'The Social Sources of Denominationalism' (1957).

while the 'sect' is a religious group that rejects it.⁵ W. Stark (1967:1–3) also accepted this dual division, but points to the great variety of attitudes towards the wider social world. In 'The Future of Religion' (1985) R. Stark and Bainbridge follow this line of understanding and point out that the 'sect' theories today may be divided into two different sorts, either as an ideal multi-dimensional concept or as an ideal single-dimensional categorical concept. In 'Magic and the Millennium' (1973) Wilson represents the former concept, while R. Stark and Bainbridge argue (1985) that they represent the latter. Their concepts are general and typological rather than purely descriptive.

Wilson's theories are of special interest to me since so many later explorations of the 'sect' model in Bible criticism use his models. Wilson has elaborated his theories and adjusted them to his empirical research (Wilson 1969, followed up by Wallis and Bruce 1984). He classifies 'sectarian' movements in terms of the nature of their 'response to the world' as well as their conceptions of evil and the human condition (Wilson 1973:19). The tension with the world generally is nevertheless the key factor (1973:59) and arrives at seven distinctive 'sectarian' types of responses to the world (1973:22–26):

1. The conversionist response, which focuses on the 'change of hearts' or the transformation of self,
2. the revolutionist response, which focuses on the dramatic transformation of the social order in a destruction of the evil world,
3. the introversionist response, which focuses on the renunciation or withdrawal from society both by individuals and groups,
4. the manipulationist response, which focuses on the transformation of the methods of coping with evil, techniques for obtaining scarce goods as the saved condition,
5. the thaumaturgical response, which focuses on the demand for magic, supernatural help, involving relief from evil through oracle, miracle and magic,
6. the reformist response, which focuses on a reformation of the social order according to supernaturally-given insights, and
7. the utopian response, which focuses on the complete reconstruction of the world according to some divinely given principles.

⁵ A similar concept is employed by Blenkinsopp (1981:1–2), referred to by Müller (1999:144) without its background in modern sociological scholarship.

The introversionist response, the reformist and perhaps also the revolutionist response are particularly interesting in connection with the study of the Johannine community. By defining tension in relation to the world in general, and not to the 'church', this kind of typologising was much improved for cross-cultural studies. Moreover, the collected material leading to the model is no longer specifically restricted to Christian groups indicating that it also may be employed in a historical investigation without a circular arguing in past Christian studies.

2.2 ELLIOTT'S APPLICATION OF WILSON'S 'SECT'

Against the criticism of the application of the 'sect' model, Elliott (1993; 1995; 1998) has rightly wanted to re-introduce the 'sect' as an interesting, fruitful characterisation of early Christian groups.⁶ Elliott does not discuss the Johannine community in particular, but the Fourth Gospel is nevertheless included in the analysis, and he presents an accommodated version of Wilson's typology (1990) that also has to be considered in connection with the analysis of the Johannine community.

I pointed out above how Elliott (1998:283ff) supports the theories in scholarly works like Seland (1987) and Malina (1986; 1995) that the model of 'faction' is a better way to understand the Jesus movement in its initial phase. A 'faction' is one of several types of a 'coalition',⁷ i.e. 'a temporary alliance of distinct parties for a limited purpose' and that is markedly different from the 'corporate body' with its permanent existence (Boissevain 1974:171). A 'faction' is a coalition of persons or followers that are 'recruited personally according to structurally diverse principles by or on behalf of a person in conflict with another person or persons, with whom they were formerly united, over honour and/or control of resources' (1974:192). It is for this reason that Elliott (1998:273–274) argues that the 'coalition' is only typical for groups in Palestine in the lifetime of Jesus. He suggests that early Christianity in its second phase was a 'sect', since the notion 'sect' involves an element of social and ideological

⁶ Cf. also the use of the model in Robbins (1996b:176–178) in relation to 1 Cor.

⁷ Boissevain (1974:173) distinguishes between cliques, gangs, action-sets, and factions.

dissociation with the parent body (1998:296). Such dissociation is not typical of any of the Jewish coalitions at the time of Jesus, since they all remained social bodies within the 'corporate body of Israel' (1998:287 et al.).

The changing conditions in the transition of the Jesus movement from 'faction' to 'sect' may be characterised by seven features that describe this change: tension and difference, recruitment, authenticity, replacement, distinction of language, exclusion, and labelling (1998:288ff). Three features are particularly interesting for my investigation: the *tension*, authenticity, and exclusion from the corporate body of Israel, the *recruitment* and the *replacement* of major institutions, especially the temple.

The salient features of the early church as 'sectarian' are presented by Elliott in a list containing 21 different features (1998:290–296). Five of these are of particular interest for the subject of my investigation:

1. The criticism and rejection of the view of reality taken for granted by the establishment (feature 4, seen in contrasts of above/below, this world/not this world, truth/falsehood, e.g. Jn 8:23, 42–47; 14:17, 19, 30; 15:19; 16:8–11, 33; 17:14–19).
2. The conception of the community itself as an elect, the gathered remnant of the parent body (feature 10, seen in the expression 'born of God', Jn 1:12–13; 3:3–8).
3. Its maintenance of social cohesion and emotional commitment (feature 17, Jn 15).
4. It may manifest one of several types of assessments of and responses to the world, society, and human condition, in the case of John, the introversionist type, in accordance with Wilson's typology (feature 19).
5. Interesting from the list of general features in the New Testament, including John, is also the offering of social acceptance and material support within the community (feature 8), the maintenance of coherent pattern of values, belief and behaviour (feature 12), the ideological unit (feature 18) and the general insulating attitude towards the world (feature 20).

The essential feature in an 'introversionist type of sect' according to Wilson is that it focuses on withdrawal from society both by individuals and groups. This is traditionally the 'sectarian' question par

excellence but I suggest that when dealing with the New Testament, this introversionism can be evaluated relatively and in no other way than in a comparison with other Jewish groups at the time. I shall also argue that groups like the early Christians should be analysed against both the category of 'introversionist' response and the 'reformist' response. As noted in chapter 1, Baumgarten (1997:13) uses the distinction to discern Sadducees and Pharisees on the one side as 'reformist' groups and the 'Qumran Covenanters' as 'introversionist' on the other.

The 'faction', the Jesus movement, became a 'sect', Elliott argues. Of the main features, only one (feature 8) cannot be directly located in the Gospel of John: the establishment of known norms and sanctions governing interaction with outsiders and society at large. All other features may in one way or the other be relevant. He implicitly seems to claim that the Gospel of John with its social background was not distinctive among the first Christians, nor can its particularities be seen as pertaining to the general Christian social matrix. Much of the scholarly discussion on the Gospel of John has, however, been concerned with understanding and explaining the particularities of John compared to other Christian writings. Nevertheless, some of the general textual observations and conclusions Elliott draws have particular interests in relation to my two main issues, temple, and 'others'. He points to the fact that the early church shared many of the values of the parent Jewish body while at the same time substantially different from it. In an ambiguous way, the *openness* to adherents from all sectors of the society was combined with a critical attitude towards 'outsiders', he argues (1998:292). This ambiguity is indeed a part of the problem that needs to be understood.

2.3 THE 'CULT' MODEL, AN ALTERNATIVE MODEL

2.3.1 *'Cult, Sect and Church'*

Alternative models of explanation may be found in models and notions not explicitly sociological, 'conventicle' (Käsemann),⁸ and

⁸ W. Stark (1967:82–83) uses the Prussian Pietists as his key example of groups of the conventicle type of 'sectarianism', but also mentions the Methodists before they were driven out of the Anglican establishment, as well as early Russian Stundists, a group that was formally expelled from the Orthodox Church on a synod in 1889. Barrett (1989:97) points to the fact that 'conventicle' in English history reflects the

‘school’ (Culpepper, K. Berger et al., see chapter 1).⁹ While the notion of ‘school’ is a derivation from readings of contemporary ancient text, the ‘conventicle’ is obviously modern. With regard to ‘Konventikel’, Käsemann (1951) stressed the exclusive aspects of the community and the notion is therefore related to the ‘sect’ in several ways. Since a central methodological key in my investigation is to study alternative modern views that may open up for other aspects in our reading of the Johannine text and its community, other models shall be evaluated.

When R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985) presented their ‘sect’ model, they meant it to be an alternative to the dominating ‘sect’ typology of Wilson and others in the study of emerging modern *new religious movements*.¹⁰ Not only did they take the notions ‘cult’ and ‘sect’ as classificatory (i.e. groups existing exactly and according to the definitions) and not as strictly ideal and non-existing types,¹¹ they also built on other kinds of empirical observations than did earlier research on ‘sects’. They refer among others to W. Stark who concluded in his studies that a ‘sectarian’ contra-culture can be either progressive or retrogressive, i.e. ‘desire a revolutionary thrust into the future, or a counter-revolutionary return to the past’ (W. Stark 1967:174).

There have been some earlier attempts to apply ‘cult’ models in NT-exegesis as an explanatory tool.¹² White (1988), R. Stark (1986b),

Conventicle Act of 1664, which forbade any religious group of more than four persons if not held in accordance with and under the authority of the Church of England.

⁹ See also Elliott (1998:273) who refers to notions such as ‘way’, ‘brotherhood’ and ἐκκλησία as specific emic self-designations in the early Christian texts. A. Baumgarten (1997) refers to the notion in the Qumran community קהל and the rabbinical use of קהל as ancient Jewish notions for ‘group’.

¹⁰ R. Stark and Bainbridge (1987); Bainbridge (1997). Bainbridge (1997:24) notes that since intensifying ‘sects’ also are new, the acronym ‘NRM’ should mean ‘novel’ to distinguish it from groups with non-traditional ideas. Bilde and Rothstein (1999b:21–22) operate with three criteria for the definition of a new religion today (translation mine): 1. Chronology, saying that new religions are religions that have developed during the last fifty years; 2. Substantial or ritual innovations; 3. Social changes, focusing on changes in practice. Normally, one had better use all three criteria, they argue.

¹¹ The use of the word ‘ideal’ implies in itself that it is non-existing, but naturally, in one sense the single-dimensional notion is also ideal since there is no group with only one dimension. What is important is the reluctance of these sociological scholars to include the many dimensions for the sake of the classification. The main point in a historical investigation is to discern what is typical and what are specific and unique features of the writer (Kee 1989:104ff).

¹² To avoid misunderstandings between the sociological notion of ‘cult’ and general

and Elliott (1998:302–303) have taken up the ‘cult’-perspectives in relation to NT-studies. None of these, however, have employed the model on the Johannine community exclusively and in comparison with other groups of the time. Where early Christianity is concerned, J. T. Sanders, quite reasonably I think, points to the fact that the relationship of Christians towards these symbols is not clear cut, and concludes that they ‘do not seem to have rejected the temple in the manner of a sect’ (J. T. Sanders 1993:124). The early church, and I presume he includes the Johannine community, was neither a ‘sect’, a ‘new religion’ nor a ‘church’, he concludes (1993:125). He does not, however, consult the ‘sect-cult’ theories of R. Stark and Bainbridge in this connection.

With the term ‘cult’, R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985) wanted to describe the religious group that is distinctively new or *novel* both in practice and belief and that may turn into a new religion—contrasting the group that turns into a new ‘denomination’ or ‘church’ and in contrast to the group that wants to stress *traditional* practice and belief. Observations today of different religious groups that earlier were all classified as ‘sects’ showed that there were basic differences between them that the traditional model did not register, R. Stark and Bainbridge argue. Little by little, the concept of a ‘cult’ came to be applied to these other groups by sociologists of religion. Well-known examples of such groups present in North America are the Mormons (the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints), Baha’i, the Scientology Church, and Transcendental Meditation (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:169–303). There is of course a long social and cultural distance between groups like the Mormons of the ninetieth century and the first Christians. Nevertheless, it is not the detailed comparison of ideas of the groups that should interest us, but rather the view of the general social processes involved in the making of this new group and the possible insights that may evolve in the study of the past.

There are some initial problems related to the use of this model that have to be clarified before extracting appropriate heuristic questions from it. First, the problems connected to the wide range of

worship, I shall use the Latin ‘cultus’ (without citation marks) for the temple worship in Jerusalem or other worship. This procedure is also employed by J. T. Sanders (1993), and see Wilson (1990:205–6, n. 4).

meaning of the term 'cult', and, second, its ideological presuppositions formulated by R. Stark and Bainbridge on several occasions (e.g. 1985). The term 'cult' may be easily misunderstood due to its various contemporary meanings, both popular and scholarly. The specifically sociological notion 'cult' is a notion that was developed by Yinger to describe the 'charismatic sect', a perception close to what seems to be a common popular meaning today as well.¹³ Richardson (1978) draws a distinction between an oppositional and a general understanding of the term. R. Wallis (1975) redefined the notion to indicate a movement that breaches the exclusivism in the Christian tradition, adequate to cope with the different assumptions of non-Christian cultures today, an argument supported by Wilson (1990:204, n. 4). 'Cult' has contemptuous connotations, only comparable to the often negative connotations of 'sect' (Bainbridge 1997:23–24). There seem to be no groups today that call themselves 'cult' or 'sect', a fact indicating the difficulties involved in using such terms, even for pure academic purposes. The 'cult' model of R. Stark and Bainbridge is a model that differs from this and without acknowledging these differences, a full comprehension of its application is not attainable.

R. Stark and Bainbridge define 'sect' as part of an integrated sociological theory of religion with specific definitions such as 'church', 'denomination', and 'cult'. Their definition corresponds to the meaning of the notion elaborated by Glock and R. Stark (1965), Yinger (1970), Nelson (1968) and Johnstone (1975:127ff). As described above, these scholars belong to the school of sociologists that want to minimise the extent of interdependent dimensions or variables concerning the 'sect' and 'church'. Actually, R. Stark and Bainbridge do not mention variables in their models or definitions, but rather 'attributes'. A category like the 'cult' is supposed to have a minimal number of attributes in order to be productive and stimulate theorising, they argue. This is why their ideal-type is defined in such a broad manner that the attributes of this type are recognised in every case they study and function as a demarcation line to other types (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:19–20). How the modern groups in ques-

¹³ Another way of defining the term was employed by Troeltsch in his category of 'mysticism' or the mystic group, especially as this notion has been developed by H. Becker. Concerning these different meanings, see Roberts (1990:195).

tion generate and function varies from group to group, although there are some common features among them. In order to classify a group as a 'cult', the sociologist is not bound to details from other 'cults' as long as their basic attributes are the same or similar, a principle that I think facilitates its use in the study of the past, possibly avoiding naive anachronism.¹⁴

In order to understand the 'sect' definition of R. Stark and Bainbridge, I shall briefly introduce their notions of 'church', 'cult', 'tension', and 'sociocultural environments' (see R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:23ff; Bainbridge 1997:24):

The 'church' is

the parent body or mother religion in low tension with the social environment, it is the group that even might represent the sociocultural environment in toto.

The 'cult' is

the social group that de facto is the beginning of a new religion. 'Cults' claim to be different and justify the difference by a new revelation or new insight that changes the original tradition.

The 'sect' represents

splinters of the indigenous tradition, it is the social group that left the parent body not to form a new faith, but to re-establish or regenerate the old one. 'Sects' therefore claim to be the authentic, purged, and refurbished religion.

Both the 'cult' and the 'sect' are deviant groups (communities or movements). 'Deviance' is defined as 'departure from the norms of a culture in such a way as to incur the imposition of extraordinary costs from those who maintain the culture' (Bainbridge 1997:24). Here too, tension is a key factor (cf. Wilson above). The main difference between 'church' on the one side and 'cult' and the 'sect'

¹⁴ Holmberg (1990:115) refers to the distinction 'monothetic' and 'polythetic' typologies. A monothetic group of phenomena is so defined that the possession of a unique set of attributes is both sufficient and necessary for the categorisation. A polythetic categorisation demands, on the other hand, only some common attributes out of many. When R. Stark and Bainbridge reduce the number of attributes and introduce nuances like that between 'sect' and 'cult', they also facilitate the historical application of the models in question since similar social events are never exactly the same and always unique in some way. Craffert (2001:36) refers to a similar discussion and criticism of Wilson's 'sect' model.

on the other, is its relationship to the society at large, both the 'sect' and the 'cult' in tension and the 'church' in harmony (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:24). High-tension is not only a question of tense beliefs, but possibly also of tense practice and social patterns such as geographical isolation.¹⁵ Both the 'sect' and the 'cult' are schismatic groups, but the 'cult' is schismatic in another sense than the 'sect'. The 'cult' may also be imported, and therefore not schismatic (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:24). Tension is a two-way street, depending both on the attitudes of the movement, but also upon the surroundings and their reactions (Bainbridge 1997:413), which renders the comparative aspects of my study even more important since our knowledge of the Johannine surroundings is only indirectly inferred.

Furthermore, it is of vital importance that Bainbridge (1997:24–25) admits that the typology (or any typology) is inadequate when we want to be scientifically precise, and that 'we will recognize that each religious organization is unique and cannot be placed perfectly in any category'. Bainbridge (1997:38ff) argues, for instance in connection with the notion 'church', that he would prefer an 'established church, or 'ecclesia' to avoid the many different meanings of 'church' today. In New Testament studies, where this notion 'ecclesia' is a technical term for the gathering of the early Christians, the notion is of course not applicable, but 'parent body' is more general and for that reason appropriate. Likewise, any definition of 'sect' and 'church' in relation to secular powers, is too modern a concept for societies before the sixteenth century. As dynamic systems, these groups must be studied for their own purpose, but my opinion is that in a historical investigation of situations of which we have such scarce information as in ancient studies, the heuristic value of modern models should not be under-estimated either. A result of such considerations is the definition of 'church and sect' by R. Stark and Bainbridge (see Bainbridge 1997:41). In fact, they want to abandon the whole 'church-sect' typology in favour of a dimension of variation or tension with the surrounding sociocultural environment: 'in

¹⁵ 'High tension with the societal environment is not merely a matter of strong opinions and deviant behavior, it is also manifested in patterns of social relations. In some extreme cases, high tension groups separate completely from the social life of the larger society and retreat into geographical isolation' (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:60).

a pluralistic society lacking an ecclesia, the church-sect distinction becomes a dimension running from low-tension denominations at one end, to high-tension sects at the other'. This location of groups at various points along a spectrum of tension is presumably also more easily transformed to other societies at other times.

2.3.2 *Modern Applications of the Model*

R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985) take the basic definitions as points of departure in the study of a confusing picture of new religious movements in the (post-)modern era. Some applications of the model are rather uninteresting for my purpose due to their modern touch. Others, however, seem initially to have some relevance for my study, for instance, when they differ between three degrees of organisational levels that characterise modern 'cults': the 'audience cult', the 'client cult' and the 'cult movement'. The audience 'cult' and the 'client cult' are characterised as being little organised, while the 'cult movements' are full-fledged religious organisations (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:26–29). This distinction between several levels of organisation itself (not the modern phenomena) is central in my attempts to find the Johannine community (see next chapter).

I shall briefly sketch some of the main results of the modern investigations of 'cults' and 'sects' in order to present common appearances of these attributes today. In addition to the mentioned study of R. Stark and Bainbridge, the overview includes viewpoints from other sociologists who have also applied the theory or evaluated it.

1. Creation by innovation (mutation)

There are mainly two ways modern 'cults' are created, by internal innovation (mutation) or innovation by importation (migration) of religious ideas from other countries and cultures (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:25).

2. From innovation to tension

From this innovation comes tension. Tension goes both ways. 'Cults' reject society and society rejects 'cults' (1985:49). In modern times, this tension can be measured empirically (e.g. by questionnaires). The 'cult' (and the 'sect') tends to break with the existing rules and norms of a religion and is therefore much criticised by the society. The 'sect' in this tension presents itself as the fulfilment of the old and established order

(R. Stark 1986a:217). There are three elements that mark tension for both 'cults' and 'sects': *difference, antagonism and separation* (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:49).

3. The need for legitimating

In the process of making and continuation of a 'sect' or a 'cult', their legitimating is important for their existence, taking the word in the plain way, describing a common human activity (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:36). The 'cult' wants to legitimate its existence to the macro-society, and it is often social pressure that changes the 'sect' into a 'cult' (see Roberts 1990:199).

4. Boundaries and accommodation to the culture at large

The 'cult' and the 'sect' define their own boundaries differently. The 'cult' group will tend to be more accommodating to the culture at large, while the 'sect' group will be more stringent. 'Cult' rhetoric tends to stress the similarities, while 'sect' rhetoric will tend to stress differences' (White 1988:19–20). It seems that new religions may grow rapidly or fail, and therefore they must appeal primarily to the social mainstream (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:365).

5. New authorities

In the purification of the old religion, 'sects' tend to use written sources as a basis of authority. The 'cult' on the other side will stress mystical, psychic, or ecstatic experiences typical to express a new creation. They seldom use old scriptures as their only authoritative source; they more often develop their own scriptures (Roberts 1990:198).

6. Charismatic leaders

Both 'cults' and 'sects' usually have charismatic leaders with claimed extra-ordinary insights and power, with divine qualities and with a unique and direct contact with the supernatural. The 'cult'-leader uses these qualities to establish the innovations, the 'sect'-leader to re-establish the old teachings and practises (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:171ff).

These applications form the basis of my heuristic questions to the texts studied (see below).

Interesting is also the model of success of new religious movement that R. Stark and Bainbridge (1987; Bainbridge 1997:409ff) propose. The continuity with the conventional faith is a much-discussed feature in connection with the New Testament and Johannine studies;

a proper view on the Jewish-Christian relationship is essential for evaluating the 'sectarian' claim. Given the final success of the Gospel (it was, after all, eventually recognised in the Christian canon), Bainbridge's claim urges us to reconsider the picture of high tension with the Johannine surroundings. The modern model depicts a connection between the old and the new, a movement that represents continuity can present itself as the fulfilment of an earlier faith traditions that potential recruits already think they possess, and for that reason the new faith demands far less effort to learn. On the other side, a movement that departs radically from the (religious) traditions of the general society will be in high tension. Not surprisingly perhaps, medium tension is said to be favourable for a group that wants to survive since a movement in high tension will be unable to build bonds with potential recruits, and the group becomes stigmatised and excluded. However, Bainbridge also supports the theory that high tension sometimes seems to be just as favourable as medium tension; it may give the movement a great strength, and particularly if it represents a real cultural alternative (Bainbridge 1997:412–413).

For the evaluation of Johannine community an evaluation of its degree of tension and its cause seems to be essential according to this theory. Several scholars have also conceived the Johannine community to be in high tension with its surrounding environment. However, since the degree of tension is a relative factor, and since we have no external information on its surroundings, I propose that its level of tension can only be properly judged on the basis of a comparison with supposedly similar groups, in this case the Jewish milieu of Philo's Alexandria and the Qumran group.

2.3.3 *Criticism of the Theory*

This 'cult' model has been criticised because of its general theoretical presuppositions and particularly of its definition of religion. Wilson (1990:204–205, n. 4) criticises a preliminary version of the theory of R. Stark and Bainbridge from 1979, in a footnote to a reprinted article from 1976.¹⁶ He argues against this way of classification

¹⁶ Wilson (1990:204, n. 4) argues that the Mormons and other groups cannot be looked upon as 'cults' according this theory, because none of these began as schismatic groups in relation to an indigenous tradition. See also Wallis (1975).

because, as he argues, it fails to see that not all groups within the broad indigenous traditions are created by schism from within existing bodies. However, Wilson fails to see that the distinction he requests is taken care of by the distinction of two kinds of schisms, the innovative versus the refurbishing aspects. This distinction is explained by R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985).

Elliott (1998:302–303) also criticises the ‘cult’ model and rejects the typology as a description of the early church, but regrettably, he mainly builds his criticism on a brief article by R. Stark (1986a) on the class basis of the different sociological types.¹⁷ He argues that the article involves more assertion than evidence on the first century situation, that the comparisons become too brief and superficial, and that they lack sufficient basis for cross-cultural comparison. He is also concerned about the lack of stated differences between ‘sects’ and ‘cults’ in structure and strategy as well as the characteristic link to the parent body. Against this kind of criticism, however, it is important to note that the theories of R. Stark and Bainbridge are theories on a high general level. By reducing the use of attributes and leaving out correlates from their core definition, R. Stark and Bainbridge are generalising their theory, and the ‘cult’-type functions just as cross-cultural as the latest ‘sect’ type of Wilson.

Elliott also argues that a dismissal of the ‘sectarian’ features of the early Christian movement, especially its self-definition as the fulfilment of Jewish identity and history ‘runs into insuperable evidence to the contrary’ (Elliott 1998:302). In Elliott (2001:18), he argues that a ‘cult’ categorisation of early Christianity is impossible, since ‘the messianic sect continued to declare its continuity with Israel, despite its embrace of Gentiles, and continued to see itself as the fulfilment of Israel’s hope’. However, this claim of being a continuation is obviously of a very special kind since it ended up in the institutionalisation of a different kind, and this must at least be studied further on a general level, and when it comes to the Johannine community the claim should be compared to the innovation it also implies. Holmberg (1990:99–101) appreciates the sharp distinction between ‘cult’ and ‘sect’ according to the theory of R. Stark and particularly the differing social locations of these two types.¹⁸ What he criticises

¹⁷ Craffert (2001:31) comments on the cult model also referring to an article prior to the 1985 edition by Stark and Bainbridge.

¹⁸ Holmberg refers more generally to R. Stark (1986a) in an article on early

in R. Stark's thesis is the assumption that there is 'a basic similarity between psychological and social processes in the first-century Roman Empire and twentieth-century U.S.' (Holmberg 1990:101). A notion like 'proletarian' is of course not a notion that can be easily applied to the world of the first century Mediterranean area and its economic system, but even with such a notion, there are challenging perspectives.¹⁹ R. Stark and Bainbridge have pointed out that all novel religious movements ('cults') are particularly and basically dependent on some social acceptance to flourish and therefore must seek recruits also from the privileged classes. Besides, since the notion 'proletarian' is no longer a part of the basic 'cult' definition of these sociologists, we are not obliged to use it.

An even more severe criticism of the model is the criticism against the basic sociological exchange theory of religion on which R. Stark and Bainbridge build their model. The main principle of this theory is that religion consists of 'compensators' for the 'things' human beings want more than anything else, i.e. rewards. By linking this principle to a substantial definition of religion, they say that religions are 'human organizations primarily engaged in providing general compensators based on supernatural assumptions' (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:8). The modern secularisation in this respect is only a seeming process; there will always be new compensations, new religions, or 'cults', they claim.

These 'exchange' or 'utilitarian' assumptions are criticised by Wallis and Bruce (1986:47–79) who rightly point out the reductionism in the thinking of religion as compensation. It is obvious that academic approaches like my own will be reductionist in comparison to the approach by Wallis and Bruce. From the point of view of the Christian church, all analytic approaches are reductionist since the Gospels can only be properly understood in a confessional situation (see Theissen 1999:1). R. Stark and Bainbridge are also anxious to point out that their definition does not imply that religion is false (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:14). From my analytical point of view, it is the promise of the model as an alternative to the 'sect' model

Christianity. R. Stark argues that 'sect' usually is a proletarian movement, while 'cult' is based upon the more privileged classes, which also was typical for the Christian movement as it moved into the Jewish Diaspora of antiquity.

¹⁹ What historians could do to solve this problem is to search for other historical issues describing similar processes described by using that term 'proletarian', e.g. lack of social influence over one's own destiny and place in society.

that is the main reason for me to incorporate it into this study. There are examples of similar approaches to this problem in New Testament sociological studies. Theissen (1999:2) in his grand survey of the 'religion of the earliest churches' defines religion in compliance with a functionalist theory from C. Geertz: 'religion is a cultural sign language which promises a gain in life by corresponding to an ultimate reality'. He defends his understanding of 'religion' by its relative openness to the claim of an ultimate reality. The same is also valid for my use of R. Stark and Bainbridge's definition. There is a danger if these models carry a heavy ideological weight foreign to the first century. The compensation-theory is, however, not a necessary and integrated part of 'cult'-categorisation criteria, and the whole question of a general and ultimate social origin of religion implicit in this sociological theory can be bracketed and even replaced, e.g. by theories from the sociology of knowledge with its general weight on social meaning. As long as the compensation theory is only a general background theory, it does not necessarily affect the application of the 'cult' model in a historical investigation like this New Testament interpretation.

2.4 HEURISTIC QUESTIONS TO THE TEXTS FROM THE MODELS

Both Wilson and R. Stark and Bainbridge have generalised their theory to accommodate the model to cross-cultural studies. Thus, the theories may be applicable as heuristic tools in the study of past religions to which we have limited access and that in many ways are foreign to us today. With few or only one dimension, the typology certainly becomes a little a-historic; on other side, however, it may also be easier to apply as a *starting point* in the study of the ancient past. Both from Wilson's definition of 'sect', including Elliott's application, and from the theories of R. Stark and Bainbridge, several questions may be formulated and further investigated.

The two most interesting 'sect' types developed by Wilson from my point of view are *the introversionist response*, which focuses on the renunciation or withdrawal from society both by individuals and groups, and *the reformist response*, which focuses on a reformation of the social order according to supernaturally given insights. The alternatives, withdrawal or reformation, may underline different aspects also in the Gospel of John. Elliott's application of Wilson's model is

seminal and he rightly focuses on major sociological issues. Elliott focuses on the development of the Jesus movement from 'faction' to 'sect', and the notions of tension (exclusion), recruitment and replacement of traditions, represent interesting features in this connection. In addition, Elliott stresses general 'sectarian' features of the early church, and interesting for me is what he calls the criticism and rejection of the 'establishment', the maintenance of social cohesion, and the introversionist withdrawal from society as well as its accompanying 'sectarian' strategies. I shall study the question of exclusion and the criticism of the 'establishment' in a re-evaluation of the presentation of the synagogue conflict in the Gospel of John. The question of replacement of institutions is a major question in regard to the question of their relationship to the Jerusalem temple coming to expression in the story of the temple cleansing (Jn 2) and the Samaritan encounter (Jn 4). I shall study the question of recruitment and the maintenance of social cohesion, the introversionist withdrawal from society through an evaluation of the attitudes towards 'others' or 'outsiders'.

From the general definitions of 'cult', 'sect' and 'parent body' ('church' or 'ecclesia') in the theory of R. Stark and Bainbridge, I have, however, found a way of handling the Johannine problem that does not correspond to Elliott's applications of Wilson's 'sect' typology. The difference between the 'introversionist' and the 'reformist' response to the world is of a different kind than the question of 'traditional', 'refurbishing' or 'novel' belief and practice. The latter aspects are responses Wilson's typology never asks for. One central challenge in this study is to locate the three groups in question (Johannine, Philonic and Qumranite) on a spectrum of social tension. To measure social tension properly is generally difficult with communities from the distant past. By using the categories *difference*, *antagonism* and *separation* (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:49) it should nevertheless be possible to proceed towards a plausible assessment. The main problem is the lack of external information, but the comparison with Philo's writings and some of the Dead Sea Scrolls is intended to reduce this vagueness in the sociological description of the Johannine community. 'Difference' concerns both analysis of expressed differences in belief and practice between the group in question and its surroundings. 'Antagonisms' are to be searched for in expressions depicting what the authors look upon as 'others' but also include expressions relating to beliefs and actions, while 'separation' must be seen primarily

in expressions relating to social isolation. The expressions concerning the temple institution and the attitudes in relation to some specific groups or 'others' pointed out by the authors of the texts, include all these marks of tension, as will be shown.

From the modern appearances of 'cults' and 'sects' presented by R. Stark and Bainbridge some suggestions are important. There are two kinds of innovation, internal or external, but in the case of the early church, the innovation is mostly internal. The elements of tension (difference, antagonism, and separation) may also be used to judge whether the tension comes from innovation or refurbishment. The study of legitimating new authorities and accommodation can be combined with the study of the temple relationship, but I have not focused particularly on these issues. The quest for the role of charismatic leaders is not considerably relevant for the study of John since the text does not present such a leader other than the alleged Messiah himself. The role of the 'Beloved Disciple' in John or the 'Teacher of Righteousness' in the Dead Sea Scrolls may of course be analysed against such theories (see Charlesworth 1995; 1996). Boundaries and accommodation to the culture at large are, on the other hand, very interesting features in this connection since they help discern between strategies typical for either the 'sect' or the 'cult'.

Against this background I suggest that the following main questions should initially be asked regarding the relationship of the Johannine Christians towards the temple and 'others' as seen in the Gospel of John, as well as in the selected texts from Philo of Alexandria and Qumran in order to test the 'sectarian' claim:

1. Tension? Are the groups in question socially high-tension groups or low-tension groups as seen from their own presentation? Is there a stated replacement of institutions, and a withdrawal? How can the issues in question be evaluated in relation to tension from categories like difference, antagonism and separation?
2. Innovation, refurbishment or representing the parent body? Do the groups justify their possible tension by a new revelation or new insight ('cult')? Do the writings present a claim to be authentic, purged and refurbished ('sect')? Do they claim to represent nothing but the presented parent tradition ('church' or 'parent body')?
3. Similarities or differences? Do the texts present groups that stress similarities ('cult') or differences ('sect')?

In addition, we shall have to evaluate the groups' degree of organisation, and therefore, before going into the investigation of their relationship to temple and social relations, the question of group existence must be adequately answered and their degree of organisation further defined. Any categorisation of social groups presupposes the actual existence of such groups behind the texts in question.

CHAPTER THREE

FROM TEXT TO COMMUNITY

3.1 WAS THERE A JOHANNINE COMMUNITY?

The fruitfulness of notions like ‘group’ and ‘community’ has been discussed by New Testament scholars in connection with all the gospels,¹ and the existence of a Johannine community or group ‘of one or another kind’ has not been a matter of much dispute.² What has been seriously disputed is only the *further* characterisation of the community, i.e. its historical background, its ecclesiological and social nature, and its role in the production of the text (‘production’ in a wide sense). The assumption that the community may be described today as a ‘sectarian’ community is dependent on the existence of a high level of organisation.

In one way, it is easy to conclude that first-century Mediterranean persons were strongly group-oriented or ‘dyadic’ in mentality and behaviour (Malina 1981:51ff; Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:86–89). Seen as such, the quest for a Johannine community is meaningless, there were *no* lonely individuals since individuals always perceived of themselves as part of a group. However, this is not exactly the issue in question here. In his article on Johannine ‘sectarianism’, Meeks (1972) argues that the existence of a community had become ‘abundantly clear’, speaking of it even in a strict sense and in opposition to theories postulating a ‘lone genius’ who wrote the Gospel addressing a general audience. Moody Smith (1974–75:231) finds it increasingly difficult to regard the Johannine discourses ‘as though

¹ In relation to Matthew, Saldarini (1994:85–87) defines ‘group’ in a more general way than ‘community’—a term when used about first century Jewish groups implies separation and independence from Judaism, he argues. Elliott (1993:127) attaches the definition of ‘community’ to a geographically limited area, for instance to a ‘village’.

² There seems to be a defined sense of identity that presupposes a community of Christians (Lieu 1991:103) and an awareness of the existence of the church (Barrett 1978:92). One important reason for this consensus is the fact that the Johannine Epistles bear direct witness to the existence of at least two different Johannine groups (see e.g. Barrett 1989:99).

they were the creations of the mind of a single theological genius'. Kysar (1992b:918) concludes in a similar vein that 'there is a wide acceptance of the hypothesis in its general form'. He refers to the thesis that the Gospel can be seen as an effort to address a social crisis in which the ejection from the synagogue becomes the rationale of John's particularities, and for that reason reflects a highly organised group. Cullmann (1975:vii) thought that the existence of a Johannine circle 'wohl kaum zu bestreiten ist'. Although Brown (1979:17) discusses problems of method concerning the quest for the Johannine community, he nevertheless boldly continues to explore the exact history of the community. Schnackenburg (1984:19) argues that the main problem with Martyn's thesis is the transition between the first and the second level, but he does not seem to have any objections to the theories of the existence of a community as such. Burge (1987:xvi) leans on scholars such as Moody Smith and Culpepper when he argues that in spite of the absence of the word ἐκκλησία in the Gospel, the communal images like shepherd/flock, vine and branches, the prayer for unity in Jn 17, as well as the whole undertone in the Farewell discourse point to the assumption that there was a Johannine community even in a stricter sense.

On the other hand, for many scholars the existence of such a particular community with strong boundaries is not as obvious as Meeks thought. The theory of a lone genius behind this writing has not lost support and other images of the Gospel's social background and its level of organisation have been painted. Hengel (1989b; 1993) doubts the existence of a 'sectarian' Johannine community, although even he finds it necessary to assume a kind of group as the author's historical audience, a school.³ Similarly, Schnelle (1992:41) accepts the existence of a Johannine school; its existence is regarded 'as certain'. Lindars (1972), Culpepper (1975), and Carson (1991) have also objected to the redaction-critical solutions and methods of Martyn and the strict notion of community that has come out of this kind of approach. Common to their alternative solutions is a stress on the view that the Gospel is mainly a product of one man's work in one or another way (redactor, evangelist). Apart from the arguments against the 'sectarian' characteristics of the community by Meeks,

³ Hengel approves the school-hypothesis (1989b:29), cf. Schnelle (1987:53) and Culpepper (1994), see also Mattill (1977) and Hengel (1993).

Barton (1998:189ff) argues that this approach is unable to distinguish one community from a *number* of communities (which would indicate a more general audience). He also contends that it has lost sight of the role of the evangelist as 'one of the most creative individual theologians of earliest Christianity' (Barton 1998:193). Meeks' article, that is devoted to attack the 'lone genius theory' and what he rightly looked upon as an inherent idealistic reductionism in the earlier scholarly treatment of John until then is criticised by Barton for sociological reductionism!

Nonetheless, to include the Johannine community in a general Christian audience fails to explain the peculiarities of John. A 'general Christian audience' is a vague and imprecise notion for a gospel like John. From my point of view, the quest for the existence of a community must not be confused with the quest for its social nature. A Johannine community is not by definition a 'sect' and postulating that the Gospel reflects a synagogue conflict does not mean that the group was a 'sect'. If there were a number of different Christian communities with a 'sectarian' nature (according to the stated definition), they would of course all be 'sectarian'. I shall also argue that a social scientific perspective may help to clarify the problem of conceptualisation of this field of study. As with most sociological concepts, the introduction of the notions 'community' and 'group' also includes a particular *modern* perspective. These are notions with present meanings not taken from the first century texts themselves and they should not be used without being conscious of their modern connotations. In sociological literature, 'group' may be described as a notion primarily of persons in reciprocal communication and meeting face to face. It is more than a group of people just sharing the same interests or opinions, casual gatherings or statistic categories (cf. the definition in Elliott 1993:130). Sociologists use the group-notion in several ways describing different levels of interaction and organisation. One may define groups or small groups as social systems in which the members are co-acting directly (face to face) during a certain span of time and delineated by matrices of behaviour dominated by lasting social benefits (Martinussen 1984:60). We may therefore discern the 'plain group' from the 'qualified group' and the notions 'social group' or 'organised group' may be applied to the latter (Thelander 1974). This difference corresponds to the difference between degrees of organisation of 'cults' (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:26ff).

The notion ‘community’ itself poses some critical questions that we must deal with. Barton (1998:175) urges scholars to recognise that the use of the notion ‘community’ in itself is ‘loaded’. He suggests that there are three ‘loaded’ values connected to the use of the notion (with some variants not reported here):

1. It reflects the secular modernity of scholars alienated from the traditional church and their nostalgia for a sense of community long lost,
2. it reflects the reductionist anti-theological inquiry implicit in ‘sociologism’, and
3. it reflects attempts to do ecclesiology (the message is ‘back to primitive Gospel communities’).

However, these loaded values do not render such notions invalid; they only indicate that intrinsic values must be presented, discussed, and implemented into the results.

I take the term ‘community’ to refer to a ‘qualified group’, i.e. a highly organised group of people interacting dynamically and physically in ways that many scholars think are reflected in the Johannine text. The degree of organisation or co-operation and interaction in a qualified group is accordingly higher than in a plain group. The definition of the group as a ‘school’ lies evidently closer to the definition of a plain group than does the notion ‘community’.

3.2 CONSTRUCTIVE CONCLUSIONS

Unfortunately, the number of statements giving us prosopographic and sociographic information from which we may draw constructive conclusions is few. The Gospel of John does present a leader and his group of followers, i.e. Jesus with disciples, evident in the calling passages (1:35–51) or as indicated in the setting of the Farewell discourse in Jn 13–17. From this perspective, every message to the disciples in the Gospel may also be read as a message to a later audience of one or another kind, and as my focus here is not the historical Jesus but ‘the historical John’, the situation *near and during* the final editorial stages is the most interesting. In addition, there are no references to any author or group in the Fourth Gospel that may be compared to the reports of a community life found in the New Testament letters. In Gal 6:11 for instance, where Paul stresses

the fact that he himself is the sender of the letter and addresses several persons, the existence of a particular addressee, a Galatian group, is highly probable. Textual evidence for the existence of Johannine community is evidence of quite another and uncertain nature mainly due its genre.

Of major importance as a source for information about the authorship and the community is Jn 21, the epilogue. Together with 19:35, the impression given in 21:24a is that the one particular person mentioned is also the one who recounted the story in the first place. In some other passages, this information is confirmed by the given declarations that this witness was the anonymous *Beloved Disciple*.⁴ Jn 19:35b refers, however, to one other person only, while 21:24b states that there were several persons verifying the testimony of that single author. The sudden change of tense and aspect in 21:24b, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθῆς αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία ἐστίν i.e. from aorist singularis of γράφω (punctual meaning) to the present pluralis of οἶδα (continuous meaning) strengthens the impression given by the author that the original text is the work of one person while the persons behind the plural subject of the last part of the verse are verifying what the first one had originally written.⁵ This conclusion is substantiated by the reference to the first person singular in οἶμαι of 21:25. According to these passages then, we seem to have ‘authors’ on three different levels:

1. The level of the disciple who composed/wrote the Gospel in the first place (21:24a),
2. the level of several persons attesting his testimony (21:24b), and
3. the level of the final editor (21:25).

Jn 20:30–31 complicates this picture, however, with its character of being a summary as these verses give us the impression that the last chapter is a later addition, and that the comments in 21:24–25 relate only to the last chapter and not to the entire Gospel. Nonetheless, even if the last chapter was a later addition, 21:25 includes a strong general reference to the ‘many other things’ Jesus performed, a fact that at least demonstrates a connection, if not a tradition.

⁴ ὁ μαθητὴς ὃν ἠγάπα (ἐφίλει) ὁ Ἰησοῦς, cf. this expression as well as allusions to this figure in Jn 13:23; 18:15–16; 19:26, 35; 20:2–3, 8; 21:7, 20, 23.

⁵ Schnelle (1987:54) supports the theory that the plural expressions ‘we’ is a plural communis (pro Harnack, contra Zahn), indicating the existence of a school.

Moreover, allusions to a *group* of witnesses are located elsewhere. References to a community may be traced in the use of the plural in 1:14, 16; 3:11; 21:24, verses that are editorial comments. In 1:14, the plural reference is reflected in ἐθεασάμεθα,⁶ in ἡμεῖς in 1:16, 3:11; 21:24 by the use of the form οἶδαμεν. The plural turn in 3:11 is, however, probably just referring to Jesus himself (and/or his disciples) expressing his authority (Hengel 1989b:29; Brown 1982:86ff). 4:38 applies a plural reference, too. The meaning of ὑμεῖς and ἄλλοι in the phrase ἐγὼ ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς θερίζειν ὃ οὐχ ὑμεῖς κεκοπιάκατε· ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε is a much discussed issue.⁷ The three occurrences of first person plural in 1:14, 16; 21:24 may of course refer to a Johannine community or someone in a Johannine milieu.⁸

The only indisputable and direct reference to a collective with a second person plural ‘you’ in the Gospel is the comment in 20:31 with the forms of πιστεύω (πιστεύσητε or πιστεύητε ὅτι κτλ.)⁹ and ἔχω (ἔχητε ζῶην) and the expressions presuppose a surrounding milieu of one or another kind, virtual or not. The formulations in 20:31 concerning the programme or purpose of the Gospel are unfortunately less conclusive. The two alternatives, πιστεύσητε ‘come to believe’ (aorist subjunctive—indicating a missionary purpose) and πιστεύητε, ‘may continue to believe’ (present subjunctive—indicating a wish to advance the maturation of faith) both have good attestation in the manuscripts. For that reason it is almost impossible to construct a theory concerning the existence of a particular community on the basis of this formulation. A defender of the hypothesis claiming that the author addressed himself to an isolated ‘sectarian’ group, would of course be delighted to prove that the present subjunctive form was the original one, but both forms are equally probable historically.

⁶ Barrett (1978:143) argues that the plural reference means ‘church’ or ‘Christians’.

⁷ Barrett (1978:243) and Carson (1991:231) argue that Jesus is referring to persons like John the Baptist.

⁸ So concludes Hengel (1993:225) when he comments on the use of first person plural in Jn 21:24. Smith (1974–1975:228, 235) is probably right when he points out how the redactional work most probably was carried out within the Johannine community independently of the Synoptics.

⁹ The different text-witnesses at this place do not affect the references to second person plural of the verb. See Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos et al. (1993:317) on Jn 20:31 and the above notes on the matter.

These and similar observations have been discussed by Johannine scholars for more than hundred years now and are still a part of an ongoing debate.¹⁰ Special attention has also been paid to second century evidence, particularly from Irenaeus, that speaks in favour of the one apostolic author 'John'. The claimed fact that there was one single author, the apostle John, is supported by the witness of a group of elders (cf. the notion of ὁ πρεσβύτερος in the Second and the Third Epistle of John), possibly referred to by the use of first person plural in 21:24 (οἶδαμεν).¹¹ Early manuscripts with the title KATA ΙΩΑΝΝΗΝ are also arguments pointing in that same direction, i.e. to a single author, the apostle John (cf. Hengel 1993:225). Still, these manuscripts are only few and the evidence is too uncertain. It is a regrettable fact for the quest for the Johannine community that the only firm conclusion possible from these observations is that the Gospel has an anonymous author. The Gospel itself names him 'the beloved disciple' and claims that he was an eyewitness and perhaps one of the apostles. In addition, there seems to have been another group of people supporting this initial witness. The reference in 21:24 and its possible co-references in 1:14, 16; 3:11 are in fact the only direct information the Gospel gives us concerning origin and background of the Gospel. All constructive conclusions therefore remain weak in nature.

3.3 ANALYTICAL CONCLUSIONS

There are, however, other statements that may provide better arguments for the existence of a community in an even stricter sense of the notion. The important statements giving us information that can be applied in analytical conclusions can be summed up and divided into 5 main categories:

First, there are editorial comments. In several passages the Gospel exhibits a clearly reflective nature, a fact that clearly *demonstrates* that it was written down a long time after the events.

¹⁰ See for instance Burge (1992); Kysar (1985; 1992a; 1992b; 1993); Culpepper (1994); Smith (1995); Charlesworth (1995).

¹¹ Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses* 2:22:5; 3:3:4, quoted from Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3:23:3–4 (Cruse 1998:86), see Barrett (1978:100ff).

The reflective and retrospective character of the prologue is one major example. In 1:5, the Johannine author declares that τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν. The present form of φαίνω points to a continued shining, while the aorist form of καταλαμβάνω refers to a fait accompli, an observation that is independent of its exact meaning.¹² The narrator thus presents himself as a narrator of past events from the very beginning. Moreover, 2:22 refers to the period after Jesus' death.¹³ The comments concerning the prophecy of Caiaphas in 11:49ff also clearly refer to the post-resurrectional epoch, and so does 12:16 with the phrase ὅτε ἐδοξάσθη Ἰησοῦς τότε ἐμνήσθησαν [οἱ μαθηταί]. The text declares that someone has been compiling and selecting the stories.

These examples indicate that there are two narrative levels in the texts, the level of the historical Jesus, and the level of post-resurrectional reflections. However, the fact that two such levels are presented in this way does not bring us much closer to the existence of a Johannine community. The reflections are all comprehensible within the frame of a situation with a single author and his general audience. The comments naturally legitimise the redaction-critical approach, but this approach does not presuppose the existence of a qualified group.

Second, there are reflections of group dynamics. When Martyn first published his book 'History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel' (1968), the theory of the existence of a community in a more qualified sense was properly stated for the first time, particularly based upon the inferences from the 'two-level drama analysis'. This way of looking at the Gospel of John is legitimised by the Gospel itself, Martyn claims, pointing to the saying ascribed to Jesus in 14:12, '... he will do greater works than this', as well as to the function of the Paraclete as presented by the Gospel (Martyn 1979:143ff). However, this way of reading the Gospel of John demands sound literal criteria in order to differentiate the two drama levels properly in each case, in addi-

¹² Καταλαμβάνω may mean 'seize upon', 'catch' or 'repress' etc. (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940:897), and in Jn 1:5 the alternatives seem to be 'understand' or 'overcome' (Barrett 1978:158).

¹³ The comment in 2:22 is also particularly important because it is 'the only kidding saying that the disciples are explicitly stated to have remembered after the resurrection' (Ashton 1991:415).

tion to external evidence in order to strengthen the historical probability. The drama with the blind beggar in Jn 9 is a dramatic unity; it is an expansion of an original miracle story and this expansion leads Martyn to detect the definite situation in the life of the church behind it and finds that there is a 'doubling' in the story of Jesus with an early Christian preacher (1979:26ff).

The essential arguments for the thesis are:

1. 'Out of the synagogue', ἀποσυνάγωγος, is found only in the Gospel of John (three times) and the notion thus seems to have an origin late in the first century. Its formal character suggests that it refers to a type of expulsion other than seen in other passages of the New Testament, but alludes perhaps to a similar expulsion as recounted in Acts 18–19 (Paul in Corinth and Ephesus).
2. The expression 'already' in the phrase ἤδη γὰρ συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα κτλ. suggests an earlier period than the time of the author.
3. The Jewish ban (בְּרִית) known in rabbinical literature and newly discovered early additions to the prayer or 'benediction' Birkat ha-Minim are a probable historical background for a formal decree of expulsion seen in the Gospel of John.¹⁴

¹⁴ Martyn readily recognises the difficulties involved in finding a historical identification of a ban before the third century CE (1979:157). The most probable candidate to a reference is the prayer 'Eighteen Benedictions' (Shemoneh Esreh, the Tephillah), since the ban was probably designed as an inner-synagogue means of discipline (1979:44). The prayer is known in Jewish prayer books (Singer 1992:76ff), and referred to in the Mishnah and the Talmud. We see that b. Ber. 28b–29a is the most applied reference (see Epstein 1961:174–179; Goldschmidt 1996:123–126) with special attention to a possible addition in the Twelfth Benediction to include Jewish Christians, additions that were later removed. In b. Ber. 28a it is directly stated that the benedictions related to the minim were instituted in Jamnia and that Samuel the Small (also called Samuel the Lesser) composed it, perhaps some time between 85–114 CE (Martyn 1979:56). An even earlier version of the prayer has been found with the word 'notzrim' (from the Cairo Genizah, see Strack 1915:26). The Twelfth Benediction says about Nazarenes (Christians?) and heretics (minim): 'Let the Nazarenes and the Minim be destroyed in a moment. And let them be blotted out of the Book of Life and not be inscribed together with the righteous' (translation by Martyn 1979:58). The point is that the gemara in the b. Ber. 28b–29a reflects a change in the prayer that might have taken place in Jamnia under Gamaliel II (Martyn 1979:56–67, n. 75). See Jocz (1954:51ff) and also the Mishnah-edition by Danby (1933:797) with references to Singer's 'Prayer Book'.

4. The confession to Jesus as 'Christ' is most probably a Christian confession from the time after the death of Jesus (Martyn 1979:37–61).

It is above all references to some formal ban that is Martyn's secure external point of reference, and from this point, he proceeds to reconstruct a history of the Johannine community.¹⁵ The essential point of reference is Jn 9:22, while 12:42 and 16:2 confirm this exclusive attitude of the synagogue in question which again explains John's pejorative use of the word Ἰουδαῖοι ('Jews').¹⁶

This theory has been much criticised and several scholars are particularly hesitant to employ the perspective on the Gospel of John in so detailed a way as did Martyn.¹⁷ Carson (1991:361) is probably right when he observes that if Martyn had restricted himself to generalisations about the Johannine community, his book would have provoked little stir. It is above all the *exact* correspondence between an early ban and the references to a similar ban in the Gospel that has been discussed and several scholars have pointed out that the ban could not have been a watershed in the history of the relationship between Jews and Christians (Stibbe 1992:56–66).

Carson (1991) very well sums up the main historical objections to Martyn's thesis. He contends that the use of ἀποσυνάγωγος is not likely to be evidence from the time after the resurrection only since

¹⁵ Likewise, Dahl (1962:128–129) argues that the use of the expression 'the Jews' is a way of speaking that 'must date from a time when the cleavage between Jews and Christians had become definite; John carries the cleavage back to the days of Jesus himself'. H. J. de Jonge (2001:139) argues that the conflict is a literary invention of the evangelist that should explain 'why those who had actually come to believe in Jesus on account of his works did not openly profess their faith', a view that I think overestimates the need for an invention of such a drastic character.

¹⁶ Reinhartz (2001a:213ff) confesses her discomfort with the quotation marks around 'the Jews', a procedure that I follow throughout the whole study. Reinhartz argues that it sweeps the problem of anti-Judaism in the Gospel under the rug. cf. Reinhartz (2001b:11ff). Nevertheless, since the historical reference to the notion is uncertain and Jews today are different from Jews of the first century, I prefer to keep the marks. Cf. the discussions lately in Bieringer, Pollefeyt, and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (2001a and 2001b).

¹⁷ Barrett (1978:93) thinks that many of Martyn's suggestions are convincing although he admits that there are some difficulties: 'He [Martyn] is however in some danger of narrowing the scope of John's work, which was rather to bring out the full theological content of the tradition than to adapt it to a particular diaspora setting' (1978:355). Schnackenburg (1971b:303) argues in a similar way, 'Mag diese Sicht zu weit gehen, so ist doch die Aktualisierung des Geschehens für die Leserschaft des Evangelisten nicht zu verkennen'.

we do have synoptic examples of exclusion in which a test of discipleship was included in the public confession (Mt 10:32–33 and Lk 12:8–9, cf. Mk 8:33ff).¹⁸ Carson points to the fact that ‘what we know of synagogue expulsions in Jesus’ day is fragmentary, but that the evidence admitted to the discussion must go beyond the herem (‘ban’)’ (1991:371). He also thinks that the evidence in favour of a re-written Twelfth Benediction is partially a reconstruction, and that the Twelfth Benediction merely reinforced an earlier and much more drastic expulsion. According to Carson, the word ἡδῆ in 9:22 indicates that expulsion must have taken place during the lifetime of Jesus, and he argues that we cannot assume the confession of Jesus as the Christ as arousing out of nowhere immediately after the resurrection (1991:369–372).

The evidence is, however, rather inconclusive.¹⁹ Carson rightly points to the weak evidence for a general ban of Christian heretics either as the herem or as the Birkat ha-Minim, referring to scholars like Kimelmann (1981) and Horbury (1982). It is doubtful that we have evidence saying that the Birkat ha-Minim was used in a similar and general manner that we may perceive from the references to a ban in John. However, Martyn was well aware of the problems involved in finding an exact historical reference to the expulsion. Even if the strength of the Birkat ha-Minim argument is not secure, external evidence, the rendering of what looks like a similar ban in the Gospel of John, is a strong indicator of a formal conflict reflected in the text, perhaps local, but indeed general in its intent.²⁰ Finally, the quest for Johannine community is *not* dependent on an *exact* correspondence between a ban or the Benedictions and the expulsion described in John.²¹

¹⁸ See also the similar criticism in Robinson (1976); Pancaro (1975:247–248); Reinhartz (1998:116ff).

¹⁹ See Schiffman (1981:152) who argues that the ban meant to exclude synagogue leaders only, and Kimelmann (1981:244) who argues that there could not have been one single edict that caused the separation. See also the similar view by Hengel (1989b:114). W. Davies (1996:52) concludes, however, that ‘the Sages at Jamnia were aware of the ‘menace’ of the Christian movement and that among the *minim* whom they sought to exclude from the synagogue were Jewish Christians who were attending those synagogues’.

²⁰ Supported by Ashton (1991:108–109) while Meeks (1972:55, n. 4) is sceptical.

²¹ Schnelle (1987:37ff) criticises those who see the Gospel as bearing witness to Jewish Christianity. He argues that the expulsion does not reflect an acute problem, but rather it is a retrospective glance (1987:42). I agree with Bull (1992:1) who argues against these objections by Schnelle. Bull argues that the lack of historical

Contra Carson, it should be especially noticed that the Johannine remarks of an expulsion do not deal with isolated cases since the decision is described as being of a general character. The statement in the Gospel of John itself is that the 'Jews' had decided on a *common* synagoga expulsion. The dissimilarities between the Johannine version and the Synoptics in fact tend to strengthen the historicity of such a decision developed long after Jesus' death. In the Beatitudes in Mt 5:11–12 and Lk 6:22–23, the disciples are warned against the coming persecution, but *not* because they confess Jesus as the Messiah. None of the synoptic texts concerning this issue (Mt 10:32–33; Lk 12:8–9; Mk 8:33ff) mention the confession of Jesus as Χριστός in this connection. Moreover, the use of ἀφορίζω (Lk 6:22) and διώκω (Mt 5:11) does not necessarily have the same meaning as the Johannine ἀποσυνάγωγος.²² Carson is also in disagreement with the judgement that the confession to Jesus as Christ is late, since passages like Rom 10:9, for instance, state that Jesus is confessed to be κύριος. However, Rom 10:9 does not bear witness to a confession of Jesus as Christ, and moreover, the fact that it reports a post-Easter confession would rather strengthen Martyn's hypothesis of an anachronism in John than weaken it. One cannot use the Lazarus story in Jn 11:1–44 and 12:11 to argue that there was no historical expulsion, as Reinhartz (2001a:223; cf. 2001b:48ff) does. First, one cannot expect the expulsion to be visible every time a Jewish-Christian relationship is mentioned. Second, the Martyn's thesis presupposes a development of the text in accordance with the changing situation of the community, and that evidence from different stages operate at the same time in the final text.

The arguments against the historicity of the ban that Carson refers to, do not take the weight of the use of ἀποσυνάγωγος as a unique Johannine word. It is not improbable that many people, contemporary and fellows, disapproved the aims and words of the historical Jesus, but a formal expulsion is not very likely in the three first decades of the first century CE. It is still unthinkable or scarcely conceivable in Jesus' lifetime, 'since it recognizes discipleship to Jesus

background for the expulsion does not affect our analysis of its theological implications (i.e. at the time of the redaction).

²² 'Αφορίζω means 'set apart, ordain, reject or banish'. Διώκω means 'drive away, expel' (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940: ad loc.). But as long as the expression ἀποσυνάγωγος is unique to John we cannot say whether these terms correspond.

not only as antithetical, but also as somehow comparable, to discipleship to Moses' (Martyn 1979:39).²³ Most likely John takes up a post-resurrectional term, and the meaning of the ἥδη must have had some bearing on John's readers, a conclusion that Carson (1991:372) also admits.

The crucial point is not whether someone had been expelled from the synagogue because they had been a follower of Jesus. The crucial points here are rather:

1. That the 'Jews' had agreed on a general resolution according to John, and
2. that those rejected were the same persons who confessed that Jesus was the Messiah.

These arguments from the temporal aspect of ἥδη, from the anachronistic use of ἀποσυνάγωγος as well its general character and christological basis are perhaps all the indications the quest for the Johannine community needs in order to affirm the hypothesis of the existence of a qualified group, a Johannine community.²⁴ Other Johannine passages point in a similar direction, particularly the whole section of Jn 13–17. If we see 13:34 that speaks of new commandment, i.e. to love one another (ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους), in connection with the presentation of partly hostile surroundings, the impression of a qualified group is strengthened. The prayer for unity among the disciples in 17:11 may also be understood within that perspective i.e. to consolidate the community (Roloff 1993:308–309). However, the anachronistic use of ἀποσυνάγωγος is without doubt the most telling evidence.

²³ Barrett (1978:361) argues that it is unthinkable 'that the Jews determined to silence the followers of Jesus during his ministry'. Schnackenburg (1971b:317) writes that by using Ἰουδαῖοι in 9:18, the author means 'Pharisees', and the possible generalisation of terms from 'Pharisees' to 'Jews' makes the feeling of an anachronism even stronger. He also supports the anachronistic thesis by arguing that the statement is so general ('allgemein') that 'man vermuten darf, der Evangelist habe zeitgenössische Verhältnisse im Sinn'. However, according to Brown (1966:380) the too formal character of the statement demonstrates its origin in the ministry of Jesus.

²⁴ There are similar general discussions among scholars using literary theories; see Stowers (1994:21–22) who uses the expression 'encoded implicit audience' to grasp the community of Romans referring to a rhetorical strategy of the text, 'it is a feature of the text itself'.

Third, there are ecclesiological allusions and metaphors. There have been many attempts to discover a more or less detailed ecclesiology inherent in the Gospel of John. Cullmann (1975:89) infers from liturgical aspect within the Gospel using an approach similar to Martyn's two-level analysis. He wants to use the role of baptism and the Eucharist to demonstrate that the community was an organised group (cf. Barrett 1978:82ff; Cullmann 1951). The allusions to baptism (Jn 3) and the Eucharist (Jn 6) are, however, too weak to be used as anything but indications of something more than a general 'milieu'. Onuki (1984:74) sees several texts as ecclesiological and speaks, for instance, about 13:1–20 as a rule of the Community ('Gemeinderegel' in quotation marks by Onuki). He refers to Bultmann's expression of "das Lebensgesetz" der Gemeinde' in 13:12ff in this connection, and there are certainly second level comments in Jn 13, but we do not have a secure ground for a quest of a community in a strict sense here.

One can also try to use the two-level perspective generally and treat the different collective terms in the Gospel of John not only as traces of a Johannine ecclesiology, but also as indications of a community even when these terms obviously are presented in a narrative about the historical Jesus. With collective terms I mean terms like φίλοι in 15:14, τέκνία in 13:33 and ἀδελφοί in 21:23. The notion includes persons with whom Jesus is speaking as Σαμαρίται (4 times in John against 4 times in the Synoptics) and Σαμαρίτις (twice in John), Φαρισαῖοι (20 times against 68 times in the three Synoptic Gospels together), ἀρχιερεῖς (21 times against 62 times in the Synoptics) and Ἰουδαῖοι (71 times against 17 times in the Synoptics). The Samaritans, Pharisees and 'Jews' fit well into the late first century scene, while the role of the High Priests is less obvious after the destruction of the temple. These terms label other groups by using collective names and by presenting these groups as particular groups. The author has suggested group-to-group relations on the first level that may have bearings on the second level as well.²⁵

Similarly, the use of the metaphor 'shepherd' (ποιμήν), 'fold' (αὐλή) and 'flock' (ποίμνη) in 10:16 may be taken as a reference to a group

²⁵ Schnelle (1987:54–55) argues that the use of ἀδελφοί at the end of the Gospel indicates that Jesus institutes and legitimates this title as an honourable title in a Johannine school as well (see Burge 1987).

connected to the entire self-presentation of Jesus in 10:1–21 as a good shepherd (see also chapter 7 below). A metaphor with a similar reference is found in 15:1ff concerning the presentation of Jesus as ἄμπελος and the disciples as κλήματα. The meaning of this metaphor is more ambiguous from the perspective of this investigation than the notion of ‘fold and flock’; the branches can be looked upon as individual Christians (not forming a group) or the unity of the branches in the vine may be understood as a symbol of the unity of the community.²⁶ The meaning of the word λαός (in opposition to ἔθνος) in 11:50 may refer to ‘the people of God’ and thus also to a Christian community but the connection has not much textual basis (Brown 1979:13, n. 6; Pancaro 1969–1970:129; Frey 1994:244). In the passage with the story of the footwashing, the sending of the disciples is of major importance (13:15), but the main point is perhaps not ecclesiological, but ethical, just saying that servants are not greater than their master (13:16). Common for *all* these metaphors is that their main points are not primarily ecclesiological, but rather ethical or christological. They are not conclusive arguments for the existence of a community of Johannine Christians.

Possible references to the later life of a community are:

- the confession of Peter, seemingly on behalf of the disciples (plural form) in 6:68–69,
- the concern for apostasy (6:60ff),
- the question of believing without seeing miracles (e.g. Thomas in 20:29)
- the declaration of the sending of the disciples in 17:18 ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, and
- the concern for those who believe (present tense) in Jesus through the witness of the disciples in 17:20 οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ.

Such themes strengthen the hypothesis that the text is written not only to tell the story of Jesus, but also to meet the needs of a later

²⁶ See the discussion in Schweizer (1959a:235ff). The vine metaphor from the Old Testament/Tanak where it denotes the people of God is transferred in John to refer to Jesus himself (Schnackenburg 1971b:250). The essential point in this metaphorical speech is ethical rather than ecclesiological, saying that only by abiding in the vine can the branches bear fruit (15:5–6).

Christian group.²⁷ Any clear ecclesiological statements would make the existence of a Johannine community more probable, but regrettably, all we have again are allusions.²⁸

Fourth, functions of the Paraclete and/or the Spirit are mentioned. The Paraclete and/or the Spirit is promised to come (7:39; 14:17, 26; 15:26; 16:13), it is declared to have come (20:22) and to remain forever (μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 14:16) although not accessible to the 'world' (14:17), and it is stated that Jesus must die before anyone else may have access to it (16:7). The promised functions of the Paraclete or the Spirit are 1. to teach (14:26), 2. to bring to remembrance the words of Jesus (14:26), 3. to bear witness to Jesus (15:26), as well as 4. being a guide to the truth (16:13), and 5. to declare the things that are to come (16:13).

These references allude to the life of a Christian 'anointed' community (Burge 1987, cf. the title). Martyn also argues convincingly that the answer to the enigma of the history and the theology of the Gospel of John comes from the Paraclete (14:16). Through his Paraclete Jesus is as much present in the community after his death as he was before, although not in the same way. What happens in the community is thus referred to as the works of Jesus himself. 'It is, therefore, precisely the Paraclete who creates the two-level drama' Martyn says (1979:148). This seems to be a well-founded thesis, but it is still an inference from allusions and a meta-perspective and cannot in itself be conclusive for the quest for the Johannine community in its particularity.

Fifth, there are future references well suited in connection with a later community. The Gospel of John has a total of 170 different appearances of the future tense. In addition come other constructions representing a future meaning (μέλλω and infinitive, 12 times). The

²⁷ See (Barrett 1978:92). There are also passages with a certain reflection of the time of the community, but where the allusion is too uncertain. Jn 19:26–27 is e.g. too personal to allude to a new community structure.

²⁸ For the connection between ecclesiology and social history in John, see chapter 1. See also Borgen (1965:90–93) on the Eucharist allusions in Jn 6 and his comparison with 1 Cor 11:27–29; see further in Howard (1943:132ff); Barrett (1978:92ff); Brown (1979:13); Pancaro (1969–1970).

occurrences of future tense may be organised according their meaning in context, and I have found three main types:

1. References to the ministry of Jesus in future form, (e.g. 1:39, 42, 51; 4:25; 6:64; 11:12; 13:21, 26, 38). 6:64 demonstrates my point when it says about Judas that Jesus knew what was going to happen at a later time, cf. ἤδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίνας εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.
2. Words referring to the time after the death of Jesus (e.g. 2:17, 19, 20; 5:28f; 11:48; 13:7, 33; 14:3, 12, 16–17, 18–19, 26; 15:26; 16:2–3, 7–8, 14, 20, 23–24). Two examples of major importance are 14:26 and 16:2. In 14:26, it is said that the coming Paraclete *will teach* the disciples: ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς κτλ. 16:2 declares that the disciples *will be put out* of the synagogue: ἀποσυναγώγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς. 11:51–52 also clearly points to the time after the death of Jesus, cf. the construction μέλλω ἀποθνήσκειν.
3. Forms that retrospectively may be read as a reference to a later community, school, or plain group (e.g. 1:50; 3:12; 4:13, 21, 23; 5:25, 43, 45, 47; 6:27, 35, 54; 7:35; 8:12; 10:5, 9, 16; 12:25f; 13:35; 14:13; 15:26). There is a concentration of future forms in Jn 14–17. All references to the disciples of Jesus in these chapters may in fact be taken as allusions to the church or community, thus the whole passage Jn 13–17. At the beginning of this section, John declares that Peter may not understand everything at the present, but afterwards he will know, cf. γνώση δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα in 13:7. The expression μετὰ ταῦτα indicates the post-resurrectional time and second level of drama.

The problem with *most* of the passages that are usually discussed in connection with the quest for a Johannine community is their general flavour. There are in fact few texts that bear witness to the existence of a community that cannot also be taken as referring to a general reader or all Christians. The recurrent references to the expulsion from the synagogue with its anachronistic touch take us much further down the road towards the recognition of a historical community. It is the combination of the anachronisms, the editorial comments, and the ecclesiological notions and metaphors that make the existence of a Johannine community in a narrower sense a probable hypothesis based on abduction (see chapter 1). Even if

we cannot say that the existence of such a community is proven by internal or external sources, the theory goes far in explaining Johannine peculiarities.

3.4 COMPARATIVE CONCLUSIONS

3.4.1 *The New Testament Context*

Further inferences leading to a theory of a group behind the Gospel may be drawn from texts originating in analogous movements or groups. I shall draw some comparisons to other New Testament texts here, but a comparison with texts from Philo and Qumran also turns out to be fruitful.

Generally, the non-gospel writings in the New Testament describe a movement organised in local groups, evident from the genre of letters. The New Testament letters present three kinds of audiences: the personal receiver, a particular congregation, and general addressees (regardless of the question of historicity). A mere reference to New Testament letters therefore only highlights the problem with the quest for the existence of a Johannine group.

The Epistles of John do present a specific group. Naturally, these letters represent a way of communication that more likely than the Gospel presents a community. The addressees (plural) of the first epistle are evident in several ways, although the formulations lack several of the ingredients of a letter, e.g. the customary greetings. The general sender is stated through the use of the plural reference of ἡμεῖς, particularly in 1 Jn 1:1–5, a passage that differs clearly between the plural sender and the plural audience. The general audience becomes evident by the pronoun ὑμεῖς.²⁹ The frequent use of collective words as ἀγαπητοί, ἀδελφοί, τέκνια, τέκνα, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι etc.³⁰ as expressions directed to the intended readers also verifies the collective addressee or—a community. In the Second Epistle, the addressee is named ἡ ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία in singular, but the author, ὁ

²⁹ There are 37 instances of ὑμεῖς in the First and Second Epistle, thus clearly expressing some kind of communication with a group, and regarding the Second Epistle at least, thus clearly underlining its form of letter.

³⁰ Ἀγαπητοί see 1 Jn 2:7; 3:2; 21; 4:1, 7, 11, ἀδελφοί see 1 Jn 3:13, 14, 16, τέκνια see 1 Jn 2:1, 12, 28; 3:7, 18; 4:4; 5:21, τέκνα see 1 Jn 3:1, 2, 10; 5:2, πατέρες and νεανίσκοι see 1 Jn 2:13, 14.

πρεσβύτερος (2 Jn 1), later refers to her τέκνα,³¹ thus again pointing towards several persons, to the family of the 'lady' or the members of a community. The third Johannine Epistle presents itself as a personal letter from one person to another, ὁ πρεσβύτερος to Γαίος (3 Jn 1), but refers several times to collective entities as ἀδελφοί and τέκνα,³² and at last but not least to ἐκκλησία with connotations both to 'community' and 'church'.³³

The references to a community as recipients of the Johannine Epistles, substantially strengthen the hypothesis of a qualified group in the Gospel as well, but only if a direct connection between the two texts is accepted. The position widely held today is that 'rather than one being dependent on the other, the Gospel and Epistles independently work from a common body of Johannine tradition' (Lieu 1991:101). Similarly, Klauck (1991:45) supports those who think that the two writings have different authors, but belong to the same 'school' (cf. Brown 1982). In my investigation, the Epistles are not drawn in as background material in my further study, partly due to fact that there is an insecure link between the Gospel and the Epistles, and partly in order to reasonably limit the scope of this investigation. The evidence from the Epistles is, however, evidence that has to be given weight and strengthens the thesis that the Gospel too, has a particular addressee.

The way the Synoptic Gospels refer to their author and originating milieu may also be illuminating to the question of an audience behind the Gospel of John. In Lk 1:1ff, the author presents himself and the receiver with a shift from first person plural in verse 2 (ἡμεῖς), to first person singular (ἐγώ) in verse 3. This is a shift similar to the one found at the end of the Fourth Gospel (20:31; 21:24–25). The shift reveals a collective basis for the story. The addressee is, contrary to the presentation in the Gospel of John, presented in second person singular. In the scholarly discussion of the Gospel of Matthew, we find a similar discussion of a community as the one concerning the Johannine community (Saldarini 1994; Stanton 1994). However, in Mt there are direct references to the

³¹ Τέκνα see 2 Jn 1, 4, 13.

³² Ἀδελφοί, see 3 Jn 3, 5, 10 and τέκνα see 3 Jn 14.

³³ Ἐκκλησία see 3 Jn 6, 9, 10. Verses 9 and 10 are associated with Diotrephes who did not recognise the author's authority. It is nevertheless a probable witness of the surrounding milieu in which the author was operating.

later audience, the ἐκκλησία (Mt 16:18; 18:17). Stanton (1994:45) refers to general methods within redaction criticism, which presuppose that the ‘modifications made by the evangelist to his sources reflect the needs and circumstances of his readers or listeners’. He asks whether it is possible to take a further step and reconstruct the history of the Matthean community or communities and affirms that ‘it is possible to discern from the text of Matthew’s Gospel the circumstances of the evangelist’s readers.’ Saldarini (1994:5) presupposes the work of an editor and argues that ‘the story of Jesus in Mt reflects the experience of Matthew’s group and its social situation’. This is also, *mutatis mutandis*, a possible answer to the quest for the author and origin of the Gospel of John, even if the reference to the church (ἐκκλησία) is missing.

3.4.2 *Was There a Philo Community?*

Was Philo an isolated figure? In one way, this question seems unnecessary. There was definitely a Jewish community in Alexandria. Alexandria was under Roman rule and we know for sure that the Jews had a structure of being a politeia or politeuma led by a council of leaders, with meetings places (synagogues?) scattered around in the city. Philo undoubtedly belonged to these Alexandrian Jews (Arnaldez 1961:19; Borgen 1984b:108ff; 1997:14ff).³⁴ The main problem is therefore the question of Philo’s exact position among these Jews, a question that is again linked to a quest for his historical audience, or should we say, audiences and to the question of his Jewishness. The question of his Jewishness is raised from the fact that he differs distinctively from rabbinical Judaism of the post-biblical period at some points.³⁵ The quest for the audience(s) is a difficult one mostly

³⁴ It has, for instance, been discussed whether Philo’s writings in fact were homilies held in the synagogue. Nikiprowetzky (1977:174ff) finds this idea, as suggested by Völker and Wolfson, strange, and would rather speak of exegetical discussions as examples from the *De vita contemplativa* may demonstrate.

³⁵ Cf. the discussion in Mendelson (1988) and N. Cohen (1995). Mendelson asks many of the questions that I also intend to ask, especially in connection with the existence of a Philo community, Philo’s relationship to the temple as well as his attitudes towards ‘others’ that are named, such as Egyptians and Greeks. These questions reflect my own two perspectives, i.e. Philo’s relationships to the external world and his internal relationships. Mendelson finally regards Philo as in an alien environment (1988:138), but I think he has not balanced Philo’s positive judgement and attitude with the antagonistic ones. The latter are best seen as a result of the

because the addressees of the texts seem to differ between Philo's types of writings and even within similar types of writings.³⁶ The lack of a known audience is a drawback for the comparison between Philo and other Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and/or Christian sources.

These difficulties must, however, not be exaggerated. There was undoubtedly a community to which he belonged and by which he was regarded as a leader. Contrary to John, in the writings of Philo we are faced with a known author at a known place and time.³⁷ This is a fact that is essential for the comparison with John, a gospel with so many unknown background factors. There is adequate information on Philo and his social situation in his writings that gives us arguments leading to constructive conclusions not available to the same degree in John. A secure way to more detailed information concerning his status among the Alexandrian Jews is to start analysing attitudes found in his historical writings, *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, and proceed to external information that to a large degree also verifies the impression given in these historical writings. These

conflict at Alexandria and the resulting pogrom, rather than as a general attitude typical for Alexandrian Jews of Philo's social and religious class. Astren (2001:123) also points to the fact that one today can see a wide range of similar points among the halakic systems of the Samaritans, Philo, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Karaites, and some minor medieval Jewish 'sects'.

³⁶ In the scholarly debate, the understanding of whom Philo was writing for is linked to the question of classification of the writings. One part is called the Exposition of the Law. The order of books in this category follows the order of books of the Old Testament/Tanakh: *De opificio mundi*, *De Abrahamo*, *De Iosepho*, *De vita Moysis* 1–2, *De Decalogo*, *De specialibus legibus* 1–4, *De virtutibus* and *De praemiis et poenis*. See Borgen (1984b:117–118; 1997:46ff).

Goodenough (1933) argues that *De vita Moysis* is a part of the Exposition of the Law and that the whole exposition was written for non-Jewish readers. Borgen (among others) has argued that the Exposition has a dual purpose as these writings were also written for the Jews to strengthen their universal role (Borgen 1984b:118). Birnbaum (1996), for instance, connects the understanding of Philo's divergent use of 'Israel' in the texts to the assumption that in each text or group of texts Philo had different audiences in mind. This is an extremely difficult, but essential question and answers can only be found through impressions of the text's addressees, not external historical evidence. I think one is safe in saying, like Sterling (1998b:188), that the *Quaestiones* (QG and QE) and the *Allegorical Commentary* on the one side and the Exposition on the other reflect different social settings, and that the former reflect a more isolated setting, perhaps a school.

³⁷ We also know his locale for certain, the Alexandria ad Aegyptum, the official Roman title (Tcherikover and Fuks 1957:61). The authenticity of the main Philonic writings is discussed only with regard to some writings, Sandmel (1984:12), but Skarsten (1987) is probably right in seeing the *De aeternitate mundi* as pseudo-Philonic. Any inferences from this treatise must be treated carefully.

writings are interesting because they deal with the typical political and ethnic problems of a minority, in this case the Alexandrian Jews. Although these writings represent theologically interpreted history writing (Borgen 1997:191; cf. Birnbaum 2003), Philo's expressed commitment in these historical treatises suggests that there is a firm historical foundation behind them. The tension seen from the conflicts reported in these historical writings very well describes the historical situation for the Jewish Alexandrians and Philo's central position among them.

The external sources on Philo—even if scarce, substantiate the historicity of his own biographical remarks as well as much of the information gained from his two historical writings. Josephus introduces him as the leader of a delegation to Gaius in Rome in 38 CE (Antiq. 257–260), a fact that also indicates his main position among fellow Jews in Alexandria. The position of Philo's wealthy family seemed to have been important in Roman Alexandria and Philo must have inhabited a central position among the Jews there.³⁸ Josephus also tells us that Philo's brother Alexander held various offices for Rome in Egypt, and Philo's nephew, Tiberius Alexander, was also involved in Roman affairs (Antiq. 18:159–160, 259; 19:276 and Bell. 2:220, 309; 5:205) and participated in the Jerusalem siege.³⁹

In particular, the *edict of Claudius* on the situation of the Jews after the pogrom and oppression in Alexandria is important for the historical reconstruction of Philo as it confirms the impression we gain from Philo himself that the Alexandrian Jews had the right of independent jurisprudence.⁴⁰ The letter (or 'rescript') from Claudius in

³⁸ His position in Alexandria is indicated in what he says about his education, Congr. 74, i.e. with philosophy, grammar, writing, reading, and the acquaintance with the works of the poets and historians. The saying in Somn. 1:121 that the man who is devoted to the study of virtue should not adopt a luxurious life, may be interpreted autobiographically.

³⁹ Unfortunately, no papyri or ostraca have survived in Alexandria. However, such remains from other places in Egypt may be to some help (Tcherikover and Fuks 1957; 1960). We also know something about his contemporary Jews in Alexandria through Josephus, particularly his *Contra Ap.*, see Borgen (1992a). We have some external knowledge of exegetical traditions of the Jews in Egypt, see Walter (1964) on Aristobulos and Pelletier (1962) on the Letter of Aristaeas.

⁴⁰ Published by H. I. Bell, see Tcherikover (1960:36ff) and Arnaldez (1961:19). The edict of Claudius is informative of the situation before the tumults leading up to the delegation described in Philo's *Legatio ad Gaium*, see Kasher (1992). In Flacc. 74, Philo writes about the Jewish administration that Claudius wanted to preserve, and there are similar ideas in Josephus Antiq. 19:279–291. See also the

41 CE demonstrates exactly that Philo's interest and participation in the Greek milieu were part of a larger Jewish tendency in Alexandria, or at least to one of the major groups or directions. In Flacc. 74, 77, and 80, he writes about 'our senate' (ἡμέτερα γερουσία), which indicates that Jews in Alexandria were organised in one body. Arnaldez (1961) argues that the one part of the edict actually was expressing the position of Philo himself—the one who fought for more privileges, associated with the life of Greek citizens while being a Jew and promoting Jewish faith—a position Arnaldez thinks many of Philo's fellow Jews shared.⁴¹ This was not only a matter of paying the tax, but it also concerned admittance to general education and the gymnasium (Borgen 1984b:253). Borgen (1984b:112) also argues, in accordance with Tcherikover and Fuks (1957:39, n. 99), that Philo belonged to a 'strong movement among the Alexandrian Jews who entered—and infiltrated—the Greek social and cultural centre in and around the gymnasium'. The edict very well explains the situation also visible in Philo's historical treatises and as an external witness thus becomes one of the best arguments for seeing Philo as representing Alexandrian Jews in several questions of political, cultural and social matters.

Scholars vary in their further evaluation of the place of Philo within the Jewish community (or communities) of Alexandria. Philo has been described as something of his own. Bousset (1906:454) compared him with the influence of rabbinism on later Judaism and finds that both the Septuagint and the Philonic writings were rejected. Hoskyns (1947:158), in a comparison with the Fourth Gospel, states that Philo was an isolated figure. Sandmel (1984:5) may be right in using the word 'elitist' as a description, but was he 'an ivory tower figure' as he also claimed?⁴² Does Philo only present his own views,

discussion of the edict and its authenticity in Tcherikover and Fuks (1957:50, n. 22; 70, n. 45). This edict is perhaps not identical to the letter from Claudius referred to in Josephus' *Antiq.* 19:280–285 (see Sandmel 1979:7–9). Claudius wrote according to this edict that the Jews were to keep their privileges and live in peace, but not try to obtain new privileges. In addition, he does not accept two delegations that speak on their behalf—as if they were living in two cities. Philo probably belonged to the group that strived for more privileges (Arnaldez 1961:20–21). See also the literature and discussions by Feldman (1965:344ff, 429–431).

⁴¹ Without giving any particular reason for this assumption: 'Beaucoup de ses coreligionnaires de la Diaspora le partageaient sans doute' (Arnaldez 1961:20).

⁴² It is in relation to his fellow Jews that Philo may be described as an elitist. Mendelson describes his elitism based on passages like *Somn.* 1:39; *Deus* 61–64;

attitudes, and social position of his wealthy family (Sandmel 1984:5)? Borgen (1984b) argues against this view and against the view of Wolfson (1962) and concludes that Philo was indeed a representative of a trend in Alexandrian Jewry.⁴³ Arnaldez argues in favour of a similar thesis, and bases his opinion on the approach of Goodenough, contra Bréhier and Heinemann. Philo was not a ‘un pur meditatif et un pur moraliste’ he argues (1961:43). Borgen (1984b:119) describes Philo as living ‘in the double context of the Jewish community and the Alexandrian Greek community’, thus reflecting both communities. Similarly, Sterling (1995b:8) contends that the wish to be both Alexandrian and Jewish makes up the constituents in what he calls the ‘Jewish self-definition of Alexandria’.⁴⁴ In the following paragraphs, I shall present some internal sources and observations given by scholars in addition to other textual arguments that may also indicate Philo’s representative status despite his unquestioned elitism and high social status.

Philo often declares that the views he presents are his own. Mos. 2:98–99 uses ‘some say’ in opposition to ‘what I would say’: ταῦτα δέ τινες μὲν φασιν εἶναι σύμβολα κτλ. (98) versus ἐγὼ δ’ ἂν εἶποιμι κτλ. (99). In Sobr. 17, he uses ‘I think’, and the phrase οἶμαι is used more than 50 times,⁴⁵ mostly about his own understanding of the scripture. On the other side, he also very clearly says that a specific interpretation is *not* one of his one, a shift that can be used to trace his idiosyncrasies. In Somn. 1:172, he explicitly says that he is not describing his own understanding, but refers to what is written ‘in

Somn. 1:233; 236–237, and rightly, I think, rejects the view that Philo was esoteric in his mystical tendencies (Mendelson 1988:6).

⁴³ ‘... Philo was not a unique individual philosopher as Wolfson thinks, but an exegete among fellow-exegetes, and a representative of a trend in Alexandrian Jewry’, Borgen (1984b:142). In his critical survey of the research on Philo, he praises Goodenough for having interpreted Philo as a representative for a movement in Judaism. In Borgen (1997:45), he concludes that Philo should not be looked upon as an isolated individual, mainly based upon a study of Philo’s predecessor in the Jewish community of Alexandria. See also the discussion and references to scholarly works in Seland (1995b:81–82) and Sterling (1995a).

⁴⁴ Sterling (1995b:17) argues that especially the participation in the gymnasium was part of Alexandrians’ self-definition, cf. the reference to this practice in the edict from Claudius.

⁴⁵ See among others Opif. 30; Leg. 1:46; 3:178; Cher. 39; Sacr. 10; Post. 28, 124; Gig. 1; Plant. 145; Ebr. 3; Sobr. 17; Conf. 144, 187; Migr. 124; Her. 23, 89, 197, 248; Congr. 23, 98; Fug. 61; Mut. 163; Somn. 1:37; 2:27, 82, 198, 242; Ios. 2.

the holy pillars' ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς στήλαις in the sentence ταῦτα δὲ οὐκ ἐμός ἐστι μῦθος, ἀλλὰ χρησμός ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀναγεγραμμένος στήλαις.⁴⁶ In Mos. 1:4, Philo states that he has learnt 'from some of the elders of the nation' (παρά τινων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους πρεσβυτέρων).⁴⁷ These examples suffice to indicate that Philo is conscious of the distinction between 'his own and other opinions'. He is also able to distinguish between when he is presenting his own views and when he is presenting a tradition or a representative understanding of the scriptures. The fact that he makes this distinction and that he adapts to traditions also indicate that he in many cases must be looked upon as representing a wider group of Alexandrian Jews, and was as such not a completely lonely or isolated figure.

Reinhartz (1993) discusses the criteria for eliciting socio-historical information on the basis of Philo's Exposition of the Law, a discussion that has received little detailed treatment before (1993:9). She is primarily looking for information regarding the Jewish family, an issue Philo does not treat directly and she therefore has to face a general problem, which is also my problem. There are several methodological obstacles to any such approach or quest for the historical Philo. Basically, the exegetical genre of all of Philo's texts has to be considered as an obstacle in the quest for historical information.⁴⁸ When Philo is commenting directly on particular issues that are mentioned in the scriptures, it is difficult to determine whether his comments reflect aspects of the contemporary life or the biblical text only. Reinhartz points to the fact that an important part of the answer to the quest for social-historical information lies implicit in

⁴⁶ Χρησμός ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀναγεγραμμένος στήλαις may also be translated 'written up in the holy laws'. Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. (1940:1643) have registered meanings of στήλη like 'block, gravestone, monument inscribed with record of victories, dedications, votes of thanks, treaties, laws, decrees, etc.'. The translation with 'law' is strengthened when compared to Philo's use of the word. It often refers to the Mosaic laws, i.e. Opif. 128 ἐν ταῖς ἱερωτάταις τοῦ νόμου στήλαις, Somn. 1:72 ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς στήλαις, Spec. 1:280 ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς τοῦ νόμου στήλαις, Spec. 1:328 αἱ ἱεραὶ τοῦ νόμου στήλαι, Spec. 4:61 ἐκ τῶν ἱερωτάτων Μουσέως στηλῶν.

⁴⁷ Philo uses πρεσβύτεροι 40 times. However, in a combination with ἔθνος it is not found elsewhere in Philo. In Post. 89–90, he nevertheless uses πρεσβύτεροι in an exposition of Deut 32:7–9, and thus connects the elders to the teaching of the Law.

⁴⁸ See Nikiprowetzky (1977:1–8) who points to the fact that scholars have not always been conscious about the specific exegetical character of Philo. See also Runia (1986a; 1993c:120–121); Borgen (1984b:123); Cazeaux (1984:158); Reinhartz (1993:7, n. 5); Sterling (1998b:183).

the issue of the intended audience of each writing, a question not easily solved but one that has to be considered in each case.

My search for the attitude towards the temple has some advantages compared to Reinhartz' quest for information concerning the historical Philo and his family; Philo does in fact state his own view and the view of other Alexandrian Jews concerning their attitude towards the observance of the Law, including the temple—statements that go beyond the biblical text. As I have indicated and shall further demonstrate (chapter 5), he often states when he is part of an exegetical tradition and when he speaks on his own. When Philo refers to particular Diaspora practices regarding the pilgrimage to Jerusalem or the discussions between literalists and allegorists for instance (see chapter 5), this is valuable historical information.

Philo does also present, directly and indirectly, a wide range of directions of scriptural understanding in Alexandria during the first decades of the first century. Several of the allegorical interpretations of the scripture seem to refer to historical situations and to some particular groups (Borgen 1997:163–164; Birnbaum 2003:322ff). The presentations of these different directions seem to reflect common views and also practices among Alexandrian Jews and they demonstrate Philo's own position. According to Philo, common positions in Alexandria in relation to the Law and the ancient traditions were the literalists, the allegorists and those, like Philo, representing the middle way. His criticism of some of the literalists and allegorists demonstrates his ambivalence for what he looks upon as the extremes on both sides and his criticism seems at least to indicate an ongoing discussion of these matters among the Jews in Alexandria.

Several scholars have pictured a map of the different positions and views concerning aspects of Alexandrian Judaism as presented by Philo and other ancient Jewish writers. The classification of the different positions follows criteria relative to the issue in question, such as their exegetical principles, their attitude towards the governing Romans, the Greco-Roman culture, the Mosaic Law generally and the temple in Jerusalem and other temples, civil rights, military actions etc.

Scholars distinguish between movements or direction in the entire Egypt at that period of time and the movements in Alexandria. Borgen (1984b:126ff) points to the fact that scholars have found three main Jewish movements in Egypt:

1. Those who recognised the religious jurisdiction of the temple of Onias in Leontopolis,⁴⁹
2. Samaritans (as may be derived from the reference to the debate between Samaritans and Jews in Alexandria by Josephus, see *Antiq.* 13:74–79), and
3. traditional Jews who recognised the jurisdiction of the Temple in Jerusalem (as demonstrated by Philo),
 - a) those who wanted to fight for their rights by military means,
 - b) those who wanted to fight for their rights by non-military means (as Philo himself).

My investigation focuses particularly on the relationship to temple Judaism, similar to the focus in Borgen's group 3 a) and b).

Scholars have found three main types of Jewish direction in Alexandria as testified by Philo regarding their attitude towards the prescriptions of the Law:

1. A literalist direction,
2. an allegorist direction, and
3. a direction with a middle position (Borgen 1984b:127).

A similar grouping is partly indicated by Philo himself in *Ebr.* 33–92. The different positions, the literalist, allegorist and the middle position, are analysed and evaluated by several scholars.⁵⁰ Shroyer (1936: 261) describes the 'literalist' position (1) as 'normative, conservative, literal', and their religion as consisting primarily in 'strict obedience

⁴⁹ See Collins (1974) who discusses the original place of the Sibylline oracles and finds that the Onias temple is a likely place.

⁵⁰ The literalists are described particularly by Shroyer, but also by Bréhier (1925:62), Daniélou (1958) and Goodenough (1969:72ff). Mack (1984:242–243) and Wolfson (1962:55ff) are among those who think that Philo tries to hold the centre. Mendelson (1988:8ff) argues that in the final analysis Philo may not have regarded himself simply as a representative of one Alexandrian school among others, but that he looked upon himself as a spokesman for the *true* interpretation. This does not necessarily mean, however, that he was a lonely figure tout court. Mendelson is also well aware of the fact that Philo dissociated himself from interpreters who allegorised the Law without taking into account what Philo looked upon as the literal prescriptions (1988: 13). Nikiprowetzky (1977:175) speaks of Philo as belonging to a small group of men in order to explain Philo's complicated style and way of philosophical arguing. I think that despite his complicated way of arguing, he represents more than just this small group of men, seen particularly when it comes to the major social subjects of discussion, as the attitudes towards literal observance indicate.

to the written Torah'. He finds various degrees of literalist approaches (Shroyer 1936:273 and 277):

- a. The ignorant, the simpletons,
- b. the narrow conservatives who resent any change of view,
- c. those who find myths in the Scriptures, and
- d. the vilifying literalists who see nothing but the literal, and because they cannot accept it as true, they reject the Scriptures altogether.

The allegorists (2) are described particularly by Hay (1979–1980:47; 1994), but also by Borgen (1984a:260). Among these allegorists three sub-groups may be distinguished (Hay 1994:62):

- a. The extreme allegorists whom Philo dislikes because they seem to have been neglecting the prescriptions of the Law (Migr. 89),
- b. moderate allegorists that did not follow Philo's path. Shroyer finds reports of them in the QE and QG, and he calls them non-mystical allegorists as they may allegorise a passage, but are more bound to the literal meaning than Philo,⁵¹ and
- c. the Therapeutae-group in *De vita contemplativa* who may also be described by Philo as an allegorising group.

Some of these Jews might have lived like Gentile Greeks and Romans, using allegorical exegesis to legitimise the neglect of traditional customs and observance. Shroyer (1936:281–282) mentions two examples of people probably neglecting traditional Judaism, Philo's nephew Tiberius Alexander (see above) and Helicon (known from Legat. 166; 178). We might call them 'apostates' or perhaps 'negligents' and allegorical exegesis naturally seems to have been a possibility for them if they wanted to define themselves in relation to their parent tradition at all.⁵²

In the middle position (3), we find Philo and his fellow exegetes who combine symbolic and literal understanding of the scripture.

⁵¹ See Shroyer (1936:263); Daniélou (1958:105–106); Sterling (1995b:16).

⁵² Since the notions 'apostate' and 'apostasy' have a particularly modern flavour, we should perhaps always use them in citation marks, but for practical reasons this is disregarded. Another more suitable term is therefore 'negligents'. Using 'apostate' is not uncommon, cf. Williamson (1970:256).

Philo may include himself in the group of allegorists by using first person plural.⁵³ Hay (1994) refers to this direction as ‘the community of exegetes’, both past and present persons, both readers and hearers, sharing this program. I will take the ‘Philo community’ to include a wider circle than those Hay is referring to, i.e. it includes people who were not themselves exegetes of writings. I cannot go further into this analysis, but I will discuss some of the Alexandrian positions in connection with my analysis of Migr. 86–93 below.

For the overall aim of this analysis (i.e. the possible ‘sectarian’ nature of the Johannine community), my primary interest is above all organised groups, i.e. socially separated groups like the Therapeutae who also used allegorical interpretation according to Contempl., but without disregarding the Law. Goodenough (1969:83) calls these ‘organised groups’, e.g. when speaking of the possible influence of the literal group in their environment, but from the texts themselves it is hard to see how organised they were. The fact that Philo speaks favourably about the Therapeutae, that he agrees with their symbolical reading of the scriptures and describes them as a distinct and organised group, nevertheless indicates that the viewpoints ascertained by Philo could materialise socially.

We may conclude that there were four, not three, main positions or directions concerning the attitude towards the Law and ancestral traditions:

1. (Extreme or radical) neglecting literalists,
2. (extreme or radical) neglecting allegorists,
3. faithful (observing or moderate) allegorists, and
4. faithful (observing or moderate) literalists.

The different sub-directions mentioned above may be located in between these directions. In two important passages, Philo informs his readers directly about his view of the extreme allegorists, Conf. 2 and Migr. 86–93. A further investigation of these passages is necessary for our understanding of him as a participant of the Alexandrian Jewish community and also for understanding his relationship to the Mosaic Law and the ancestral traditions generally. In relation to my

⁵³ See e.g. the ‘we’- versus ‘they’-statement in Conf. 190: ταῦτα μὲν ἡμεῖς, οἱ δὲ τοῖς ἐμφανέσι καὶ προχείροις μόνον κτλ.

analysis of John later, the Philo evidence is used in an essential way, a fact that presupposes a closer look into these passages.

Conf. 2 is a passage that presents the literalists who also seem to have been neglecting the prescriptions and were perhaps apostates, as Shroyer (1936:277) argues.⁵⁴ Philo describes his opponents initially as having an ‘atheist’ position (ἄθεότης). If these were Jews, the whole treatise may be looked upon as a defence of ancestral traditions, particularly his use of the scriptures and of monotheism. The detailed knowledge of the Jewish narratives that Philo attributes to them, indicates that these ‘atheists’ were Alexandrian Jews, or at least included Jews.⁵⁵ A closer look at the passage and its context discloses two literalist directions, one pious and one impious, in addition to Philo’s own position evident in his refutation of them both and particularly the impious one.

The main purpose of the treatise is taken up at the very beginning in an introduction that goes as far as paragraph 14. Philo’s starting point is the narrative of Babel in Gen 11:1–8 (§1). At the outset he presents his arguments against those who disregard the constitution of the fathers and are always eager to accuse the laws (§2–13). In §14 he also refers to the literal direction that defends the literal reading and explains the difficulties in the Babel narrative in their straightforward way. He nevertheless argues that the allegorical interpretation is a better way to explain the Babel narrative. From §15 Philo presents his own alternative allegorical understanding of the narrative, an understanding that for the purpose of this investigation is uninteresting. Instead, I will focus on the presentation of the position he presents and then attacks in §§2–13. §14 should also be brought into the discussion because Philo here brings the introduction to a close by referring to the persons described initially in §2.

Philo rejects a literalist approach to the Law by declaring that he does not want to discuss with these literalists, only to present his own understanding.⁵⁶ The first substantial description of this literal

⁵⁴ Other passages describing similar tendencies are e.g. *Sobr.* 44; *Agr.* 157.

⁵⁵ In spite of the implicit dichotomy evident in the expression παρ’ ὑμῖν in αἱ ἱερὰ λέγόμεναι βίβλοι παρ’ ὑμῖν (§3, or §2 in the Loeb edition) distinguishing these others from Philo himself.

⁵⁶ “Persons who cherish a dislike of the institutions of our fathers and make it their constant study to denounce and decry the Laws find in these and similar passages openings as it were for their godlessness. ‘Can you still,’ say these impious scoffers, ‘speak gravely of the ordinances as containing the canons of absolute truth?’” (*Conf.* 2).

position is that they are displeased with major Jewish institutions. The persons referred to are οἱ μὲν δυσχεραίνοντες τῇ πατρίῳ πολιτείᾳ i.e. 'persons who cherish a dislike of the institutions of our fathers'. The translation by Colson and Whitaker (1932) of the first sentence and especially of *δυσχεραίνω τῇ πατρίῳ πολιτείᾳ* is somewhat misleading from my point of view. Generally, *πολιτεία* may be translated with 'the conditions and rights of a citizen, citizenship; the life of a citizen, civic life' in addition to 'government' and 'constitution of a state' (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940:1434). Philo does not mention any particular Jewish institutions or organised activity such as the temple in Jerusalem or the temple tax gathered in Alexandria and in other Diaspora towns mentioned other places (Legat. 156, 188 and Spec. 1:76–78). *Πολιτεία* may refer to these concrete institutions, either in Jerusalem or Alexandria. Similar references to those who mock the scriptures including the lawgiver Moses, and traditions are numerous in Philo, often initiating his allegorical interpretations.⁵⁷

The second description in that same paragraph is that they are always seeking to blame and accuse the laws (οἱ νόμοι) and 'the ordinances' (τὰ διατεταγμένα). The accusation is that they deny the originality of the Jewish holy books. The myths found in the Scriptures can also be found in other writings, as e.g. in Homer, they claim according to Philo (§4). As for the Babel narrative, it is obviously a fable or myth (μύθος) they say, arguing inter alia that the confusion of tongues has not prevented people from doing evil deeds (§13), τί οὖν ὡς κακῶν αἴτιον τὸ ὁμόγλωττον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡφάνιζε, δέον ὡς ὠφελιμώτατον ἰδρῦσθαι;⁵⁸ In §12 Philo says that they refer to countries with a common language. In such countries the inhabitants have been kept free from disaster, Philo's opponents claim, and one might take this to refer to their admiration for the Hellenistic culture as such.⁵⁹

§14 redirects this exegetical solution to 'those who take the letter of the law in its outward sense and provide for each question as it

⁵⁷ In Virt. 108 Philo paraphrases Deut 23:8 and refers to the mockers of the Jews as if they were attacking the core religion, see also Mut. 61.

⁵⁸ 'Why then, they ask, did God wish to deprive mankind of its universal language as though it were a source of evil, when He should rather have established it firmly as a source of the utmost profit?' (Conf. 13).

⁵⁹ Kahn (1963:48, n. 1) says that 'Les détracteurs de la Bible, très fiers de la civilisation hellénistique, pensent sans doute à la langue grecque parlée, au temps de Philo etc.'.

arises the explanation which lies on the surface . . .⁶⁰ Philo thus describes the exegetical method of the first mentioned ‘ungodly ones’ as being a literalist approach as well. There are, however, severe difficulties involved in the translation of this sentence in §14 because of a lacuna in the manuscripts.⁶¹ Nevertheless, Philo clearly states in other places that he does not want to blame this literalist approach, because ἴσως γὰρ ἀληθεῖ καὶ αὐτοὶ χρῶνται λόγῳ, ‘for perhaps the truth is with them also’ (Conf. 190) where the καὶ αὐτοὶ is extremely important since it sufficiently reduces the impression of high tension in this connection.

The neglect of the ancestral tradition, possibly including the temple religion, indicates that the impious literalists represented a divergent Jewish position in Alexandria. Philo does not reveal anything concerning their degree of organisation. Nevertheless, I think it is justified to say that Philo’s refutation does speak in favour of a movement (little organised) rather than a qualified group. In my way of argument I am dependent neither on any institutionalisation of this position nor other positions. My intention is simply to try to spot Philo’s own place as recounted by his criticism of other positions to see what this may tell us about the existence of the alleged Philo community. Their alleged arguments in favour of the Hellenistic culture may indicate that they were under social pressure from this dominating way of life.

Philo’s own loyalty to the traditional customs and to the prescriptions of the Law, including the temple prescriptions, comes to expression in Conf. 2 in the critique against the extreme literalists, but it is even more evident in Migr. 86–93. This passage also presents the extreme allegorists, and in order not to repeat myself later, I shall undertake the analysis of Philo’s position as expressed in these passages from *De migratione Abrahami*, while discussing the extreme

⁶⁰ διελέγξουσιν οἱ τὰς προχείρους ἀποδόσεις τῶν αἰὲ ζητουμένων ἐκ τῆς φανερᾶς τῶν νόμων γραφῆς ἀφιλονείκως ταμιευόμενοι (Conf. 14), cf. the suggestions for the Greek text and the reading by Colson and Whitaker (1932). He also alludes to a pious literalist explanation of the Babel narrative in Conf. 155–156.

⁶¹ The Cohn, Wendland and Reiter’s (1896–1915) Philo edition contains a lacuna in §14. Colson and Whitaker (1932:18–19) and Kahn (1963:158) both agree that Philo differs between the pious literalist, impious literalist and his own pious reading. Thus the emendations in this passage should reflect that view. These impious literalists seem to have been Jews that had become apostates (Shroyer 1936:279–280).

allegorists. Migr. 86–93 is a much cited passage of Philo due to the unfolded solutions regarding a difficult question raised by the study of his works, i.e. the question of the relationship between Jewish and Greek/Hellenistic ideas and practices.⁶² In this passage Philo comments on the migration of Abraham reported in Gen 12:1–4, 6 (he omits Gen 12:5 for unknown reasons). The whole treatise may be divided into two parts (Cazeaux 1965:15–80): 1. §§1–126 concerning the divine gifts and 2. §§127–175 presenting the conclusions.

Our passage, §§86–93, is an excerpt from the first part of the treatise, a part that is clearly divided thematically by Philo himself into four sections, each denoting four divine gifts presented to the soul, allegorically explained. In §86 he comments on Gen 12:2, ‘I will make your name great’, in a passage going from §86 to §105, where he discusses the necessity of having both a good reputation and good virtues, or fair fame and includes a warning against lack of honour and reputation. Similar warnings are found in several places in Philo’s writings when he defends the necessity of virtues.⁶³ ‘Fair fame’, says Philo, ‘is a great matter’ (§88).⁶⁴ We should note that the expression ἡ πάτριος πολιτεία is a very general formulation, there is no direct link to a particular kind of constitution or state (πολιτεία). Although the subsequent diatribe against people who regarded the Law in the light of symbols of ‘matters belonging to the intellect’ (τὰ νοητὰ πράγματα) is a way of speaking that reflects a Platonic and/or Stoic terminology, Philo draws a line from these general reflections to a particular practice.⁶⁵ In one way in §§88–89 he is also quite general

⁶² Examples of later analysis of this passage, Wolfson (1962:66ff); Goodenough (1962:79ff; 1969:83ff); Hay (1979–1980:50; 1994:63); Borgen (1980; 1984a:260); Kraft (1975); Mendelson (1988:13). See also Runia (1993a:93).

⁶³ In Conf. 18 we find warnings against ‘dishonour, want of reputation, and poverty’ (ἀτιμία, ἀδοξία, πενία). Mut. 45 says that good reputation τὸ εὐδοκίμησαι is important both with God and men. Deus 17 warns against selfishness and in Ebr. 84 Philo cites Prov 4:3 (LXX) to argue for the necessity of honouring God as well as the customs (νόμιμα) of society, cf. Ebr. 81 where the meaning of ‘father’ and ‘mother’ is explained.

⁶⁴ ‘And this fair fame is won as a rule by all who cheerfully take things as they find them and interfere with no established customs, but maintain with care the constitution of their country’ (Migr. 88).

⁶⁵ The discussion of which tradition influenced Philo most shows that this is still an unsettled question, see the references to the debate in Reydam-Schils (1994). For earlier discussions, see Billings (1979); Williamson (1970:268ff); Borgen (1980:86); Runia (1986b:467ff). See also Borgen (1987:234); Tronier (1996). The Greek Plato texts below are in accordance with the Loeb edition (Plato 1914–1936).

in his criticism of these other allegorists. However, the repeated remarks on what he deems wrong, i.e. the neglect of Jewish institutions, if not demonstrating the historicity of this information, do place Philo in a middle position between literalists and allegorists.

According to Platonic doctrines ideas are more real or pure than their visual shadows, or what Philo in *Migr.* §90 calls τὴν ἀλήθειαν γυμνὴν αὐτὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρευνῶσιν, i.e. 'they seek for plain naked truth by itself'.⁶⁶ He seems to point to a contradiction of this position (§90); on the one side his opponents use the sacred word as their point of departure for their symbolic understanding, on the other side they disregard the teaching by the same sacred word that demands good reputation. The expression ὁ ἱερὸς λόγος indicates that Philo is narrowing his perspective to specific Jewish issues, and accordingly the words of the ancient 'divinely empowered men' (θεσπέσιοι ἄνδρες) must be taken as a specification of the sacred word. One reason for not abrogating the Law is, according to Philo, that these men were better than those of his own day.⁶⁷

§91 introduces a shift in the focus of the text, presenting specific comments on the practising of the Law and its prescriptions. The shift is typical for Philo (Cazeaux 1984:181–182). The shift within the section §§88–105 demonstrates a rhetorical method that Cazeaux calls 'la conscience de lire'. In fact, he would not say that it is a proper method, just a consent with the text. After the section in *Migr.* 88–90 the readers expect a discussion of the relationship between internal and external categories of moral principles. Instead, Cazeaux says, it is the observance of the Law that is treated by a discussion of the transition from the subjective and moral point of view to the metaphysical and objective point of view.

⁶⁶ Billings (1979) argues against Bréhier (1925) at this point. Bréhier (1925:296–297) argued that the ideal world for Philo was only a world of moral ideas. Billings (1979:38, 76) on the other hand cites passages that are in accordance with the Platonic doctrine, e.g. *Spec.* 1:45–49, and concludes that in both Philo and Plato the world of ideas is a world of concepts made objective, 'including, besides moral and intellectual notions, the ideal counterpart of all things'.

⁶⁷ Wolfson (1962:66–67) points out three characterisations of the allegorists presented by Philo in *Migr.* 89ff: 1) he says that they place themselves in the position of the defying public opinion, 2) the practical observance of the laws is of great antiquity and 3) he points to the importance of the outward observance of the Law for the understanding and preservation of its inner meaning.

Philo in one way agrees with the allegorical understandings of these prescriptions, once in §91 and twice in §92.⁶⁸ In Cher. 86, he claims likewise that it is actually only God that is able to truly keep the festivals (cf. *μόνος ὁ θεὸς ἀψευδῶς ἑορτάζει*). These statements are in accordance with other statements that he presents elsewhere (e.g. Deus 8), and together they form a pattern that also strengthens the hypothesis that these statements reflect Philo's social situation. At the end of §92 Philo points to the fact that this allegorical way of looking at the traditions may easily also lead to the neglect of the service of the *temple* as well as other institutions, a consequence he is more than eager to fight. These examples demonstrate that Philo now has left the general level denoted by his earlier use of the notion *πολιτεία*, and that he has more specific Jewish institutions and traditions in mind. A suitable designation for those following this kind of practice is 'anti-ritualists' (Nikiprowetzky 1967b), or 'reform' movement' (Goodenough 1962:79), to use a word with more modern flavour.

In §93 Philo presents the arguments for his urge by using the soul-body dichotomy, *ἀλλὰ χρὴ ταῦτα μὲν σώματι εἰκέναι νομίζειν, ψυχῇ δὲ ἐκεῖνα*.⁶⁹ The use of the notion 'body' is here employed in a neutral way in a combination with *οἶκος*. In Opif. 134 Philo attaches the dualism to the creation of man in Gen 2:7 (*σῶμα καὶ ψυχή*), and the promise of God in Lev 26:12 to walk 'in you' or 'among you' (LXX *ἐν ὑμῖν*) is used in Somn. 1:148–149; 2:248, Praem. 123 et al. to describe a possibility for the soul to be a house of God (*θεοῦ οἶκος*). The general Philonic view of the body is, however, much more negative, in accordance with a common Hellenistic body-soul dualism (Billings 1979:72).

Plato uses 'body' in a negative way, e.g. in Phaedo 64c, Symposium 216d–217a and in Leges 869b. Philo's negative view on the body is seen in several places. In Her. 69 he urges the soul (*ψυχή*) to be a fugitive of itself and in Her. 71 he lets the mind (*διάνοια*) explain

⁶⁸ §91 γὰρ ὅτι ἡ ἐβδόμη δυνάμεως κτλ. (on the Sabbath), §92 ὅτι ἡ ἑορτὴ σύμβολον ψυχικῆς εὐφροσύνης ἐστὶ κτλ. (on the Feast or generally 'the festivals'), §92 ὅτι τὸ περιτέμνεσθαι ἡδονῆς κτλ. (on circumcision). The initial μή in §91 and twice in §92 deny the extreme allegorical understandings.

⁶⁹ 'We shall look upon these outward observances as resembling the body, and their inner meanings as resembling the soul' (Migr. 93).

how it migrated from the body. This dualism may also come to expression negatively in Philo when he says that the soul, ψυχή, is in the body ‘like a man who is bound in prison’ (ὥσπερ ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ καθειργμένος, Ebr. 101). The same Platonic-Pythagorean body-and-soul relationship is also found in Leg. 1:108 when describing the body as a tomb (σῶμα as σῆμα), ὅτε ζῶμεν, τεθνηκυίας τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ὡς ἂν ἐν σήματι τῷ σώματι ἐντετυμβευμένης⁷⁰ (see Zeller 1995:44). In Leg. 3:69 the body is described as wicked and a plotter against the soul, at all times lifeless and dead. In addition, the negative attitude towards the body is expressed in the use of ‘Egypt’ as the symbol for body and the passions. Leg. 2:59 reads that Egypt is the body in the phrase μὴ καταβῆναι εἰς Αἴγυπτον, τουτέστι τὸ σῶμα. Similarly, Leg. 2:103 declares that the Egyptian or bodily character of passion is to be drowned (καταποντόομαι) according to an exposition of Exod 15:1.⁷¹

Nevertheless, the negative attitude towards the body, does not mean that the body and its principles are disregarded completely. For just as ‘one has to take care of the body’ (σώματος προνοητέον) because it is the dwelling-place of the soul, Philo argues, so one has to pay attention to the literal meaning of the Law, τῶν ῥητῶν νόμων ἐπιμελητέον. Philo uses similar ways of arguing in other passages. It is repeated in Migr. 127 and in Conf. 190 he expresses a similar point of view, against someone with a literal understanding of the scriptures.⁷² This passage very well demonstrates both the necessity of the letter and the superiority of the meaning of the letter, as contributed to these factors by Philo.

To observe (φυλάσσω) the Law is said to make the symbols of the intellect more transparent, cf. the sentence φυλαττομένων γὰρ τούτων ἀριδηλότερον κἀκεῖνα γνωρισθήσεται, ὧν εἰσιν οὗτοι σύμβολα.⁷³ The

⁷⁰ ‘When we are living, the soul is dead and has been entombed in the body as in a sepulchre’ (Leg. 1:108). The σῆμα-σῶμα notion is found in Plato: Gorgias 493a says ‘the body is our tomb’ (Lamb 1925:493–494), see Williamson (1970:269).

⁷¹ ‘Horse and rider he has thrown into the sea’ (ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν, Exod 15:1 LXX).

⁷² μετελθεῖν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰς τροπικὰς ἀποδόσεις, νομίσαντας τὰ μὲν ῥητὰ τῶν χρησμών σκιὰς τινὰς ὡσανεὶ σωμάτων εἶναι, τὰς δ’ ἐμφαινομένας δυνάμεις τὰ ὑφεστῶτα ἀληθεῖα πράγματα. ‘Still I would exhort them not to halt there, but to press on to allegorical interpretation and to recognize that the letter is to the oracle but as the shadow to the substance and that the higher values therein revealed are what really and truly exist’ (Conf. 190).

⁷³ ‘If we keep and observe these, we shall gain a clearer conception of those things of which these are the symbols’ (Migr. 93).

notion employed here, ἀριδηλότερον, i.e. 'more clearly', is important because it seems to reflect an epistemological claim. It indicates both that the knowledge and acceptance of there being a prescription of the Law is crucial and important for the understanding of the reality it reflects, its inner deeper meaning. By observing the Law, one gets to know it in a superior way, indicated in the text by the comparative of ἀρίδηλος. Thus Wolfson (1962) is right when he writes about Philo's view that '... it is only through the outer observance of the law that we can gain a clearer conception of its inner meaning'. Philo in fact declares that there are two ways that lead to knowledge of the symbols, both rationally and empirically, i.e. both by knowledge of the deeper meaning of the Law, and by observance itself. The thought that practice leads to a better understanding of the Law is particularly important since it takes us far away from ordinary Platonism, as also argued by Cazeaux (1965).⁷⁴ In fact, the statement that observance may be more important than theoretical reflections (Migr. 93) alludes more to an Aristotle-like theory of empirical induction, but the criticism of the extreme allegorists of living alone with neither city nor village (Migr. 90) also alludes more to a common Greek theory of praxis that no man can live well except in a community (cf. Jones 1970:255ff). I find it probable that the same uncertainty is present when Philo states in Leg. 3:47 that not everyone who seeks God may expect to find him (cf. the phrase εἰ δὲ ζητοῦσα [sc. διάνοια] εὐρήσεις θεόν, ἄδηλον, πολλοῖς γὰρ οὐκ ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτόν).⁷⁵

Philo then reinforces his theory of the necessity of observance of the Law with five scriptural proofs based on the story of Abraham,

⁷⁴ 'Il [Philon] conclut: l'observation exacte des préceptes rejailit sur l'intelligence de la Loi (Philon nous égare loin de Platonisme commun!) etc.' (Cazeaux 1965:45). The comparative form of ἀρίδηλος also reflects an uncertainty in the intellectual study of the meaning of the symbols. The uncertainty may reflect the same uncertainty that Plato reflects in the dialogue Parmenides. In this dialogue Plato is criticising his own theory of forms, see particularly the discussion in §130ff. One of Parmenides' criticism of the 'young' Socrates is that forms and sense objects are too separate, i.e. the problem of transcendence:

(Parmenides:) 'You may be sure,' he said, 'that you do not yet, if I may say so, grasp the greatness of the difficulty involved in your assumption that each idea is one and is something distinct from concrete things' (... εἰ ἐν εἶδος ἕκαστον τῶν ὄντων αἰεὶ τι ἀφοριζόμενος θήσεις, §133a-b).

⁷⁵ 'But whether thou wilt find God when thou seekest is uncertain, for to many He has not manifested Himself' (Leg. 3:47).

of Leah, of the women who provided the ornaments in the temple, of Isaac's prayer for Jacob and of the holy vesture of the high priest, all allegorically explained (§§94–105). I shall not go further into these scriptural proofs, only note that they all point to the necessity of a body for the understanding of the soul. Philo employs in addition an argument of function when pointing to the fact that such attitudes will make the many (οἱ πολλοί) blame and accuse them (§93), a point that refers back to the point of departure for the whole discussion (§86). The zeal of the many mentioned here is similar to the zeal of the pilgrims referred to in Spec. 1:68 (see further down). This functionalism is in this connection less interesting but it nevertheless strengthens the view that he is describing real historical positions.⁷⁶

It seems rather meaningless to suppose that Philo did *not* have a real audience. The *Wirkungsgeschichte*, the defensive character of his historical treatises, and the external sources available for us on Philo and his situation, as well as his fellow Jews in Alexandria both before and after him point in that same direction. Above all the historical treatises are important for determining his social position. His own remarks about the ancestral tradition and his defence of this tradition indicate that he wanted to be looked upon as part of this tradition. When asking the question if he represented one particular organised group of Jewish Alexandrian, we only get answers related and limited to the question asked and we can only constructively reach an overall conclusion. This means that if we use the notion 'community', 'group' or 'circle' in connection with Philo, we could apply it to the Jewish community in Alexandria generally. This will include literalists, allegorists and others, or his fellow relatively unknown allegorists, or the group of Jews that strived for more privileges as seen in the edict from Claudius, or even the Therapeutae-group and those sympathising with them. Since our knowledge of the actual existence of such groups is very limited, we should perhaps only speak of 'directions' or only apply the notion of a 'Philo community' or 'Philo group' in a general way, referring to *Jews in Alexandria like Philo*.⁷⁷ If there were a Philo group basically loyal to the ancestral

⁷⁶ The censorship seems to have found extreme expressions too, compared and discussed concerning Philo and Luke-Acts by Seland (1995b).

⁷⁷ See also (Mack 1984:242–243) and Mendelson (1988:3, n. 3). Mendelson speaks

tradition like he was, it was probably little organised and only slightly different from other Alexandrian Jews of the general society both in practice and belief. The mentioning of prayer houses (προσευχή= synagogue?) in Alexandria shows at least that they had public meeting places. Although Philo may reject the literal reading (Conf. 190) and sometimes also allegorical reading (Abr. 99), his way of arguing against those who read the scripture in these ways, reduces the impression of a severe internal tension among Alexandrian Jews. In addition, it makes the existence of general Philo audience, and even a 'Philo community' plausible.

The differences in material and result between the quest for a Philo community and for a Johannine community are evident. There is nothing in this comparison with Philo that may be used as arguments for a direct connection between these milieus and the existence of a Johannine community. The difference of literary genres emphasises the dissimilarities. However, differences may also be telling and the fact that we in one sense may speak of a Philo community, nevertheless favours a further comparison between Philo and John that is interesting from a sociological point of view. The substantial similarities concerning the issues at stake in this investigation also ease a comparison.

3.4.3 *Was There a Qumran Community?*

Our information about the origin of the Qumran writings and the persons who placed them in the caves at the shores of the Dead Sea, is scarce and uncertain despite the great numbers of scrolls and fragments now released.⁷⁸ Nevertheless, some historical solutions to the Qumran enigma are more probable than others.

It is a widely held hypothesis today that the scrolls and fragments found at Qumran belonged to an Essene-group, known from the classical sources of Josephus, Philo, and Pliny.⁷⁹ These classical sources

of Philo as representative of a school and to 'Philo's group' or his 'inner circle' or 'Philo's circle' (1988:8), referring, like me, somewhat vaguely to 'like-minded individuals'.

⁷⁸ Usually estimated to be about 850 scrolls (Brooke 1999a:9), the major manuscripts are now published in Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997; 1998) and with photographic copies on microfiches by Tov (1993). Qumran titles, abbreviations, Hebrew and English quotes in this study are from Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997; 1998) if not otherwise stated.

⁷⁹ As presented by Vermes and Goodman (1989: ad loc.) and Cross (1995:54).

are external observations that may verify the existence of the group, but there are important differences in the presentation of the Essenes among these sources,⁸⁰ and some scholars therefore doubt the usefulness of the notion 'Qumran community', see e.g. P. Davies (1995); Talmon (1994). The disagreements concern also whether the archaeological artefacts and texts found in the caves surrounding the Chirbet Qumran come from the particular group that dwelled at the site or whether the writings have another origin, e.g. the Jerusalem temple.⁸¹ Anyway, the notion 'Qumranites' should be used as a designation on the former dwellers of the Chirbet Qumran only. It is probable that the writings found in the caves were used by these Qumranites and that they reflect their thinking and practice somehow. These dwellers on the site seem in one way or other to have been responsible for the writings and/or collection of the scrolls of what has often been called the Qumran 'library'.⁸² We might call this an 'Essene library' and the community behind the library an 'Essene community'. The word 'library' must be used with caution and in quotation marks as the concept of 'libraries' may be misleading due to the lack of ancient direct reports of such a library, as well as lack of similar libraries elsewhere at the time (Shavit 1994).

There are (at present) at least four main hypotheses among serious scholars today concerning the origin of the community, all founded on the Essene basis for the Qumran findings:⁸³

1. The traditional Essene hypothesis, as proposed by Sukenik saying that the Qumran community was Essene.⁸⁴
2. The Groningen hypothesis, as proposed by Martínez and van der Woude (1990:lv; see Martínez and Barrera 1995:77–95), a

⁸⁰ The differences have been investigated by several scholars, see Beall (1988).

⁸¹ Golb (1995) argues that the library originated in the temple of Jerusalem. It has also been speculated that the ruins at Qumran were ruins of a country villa (Donceel and Donceel-Voûte 1994), see e.g. the sound counter-arguments in Magness (1996) comparing the Qumran site with known villae rusticae elsewhere.

⁸² See Newsom (1990); Cross (1995); Stegemann (1994:116ff).

⁸³ See also the synopsis of the scholarly views in Cryer and Thompson (1998).

⁸⁴ Sukenik in an article in Hebrew 'The Collection of the Hidden Scrolls Which Are in the Possession of the Hebrew University' (ed. N. Avigad, Jerusalem, Bialik Institute, 1954), cf. VanderKam (1994:98). A part of the traditional hypothesis is the theory that the movement originated in the Maccabean area, see Vermes (1975:xvi, xxix) and that the notion Wicked Priest refers to Jonathan and/or possibly Simon Maccabaeus.

variant of the traditional hypothesis, saying that the Qumran scrolls belonged to a splinter Essene group.

3. The revised traditional hypothesis, proposed by Stegemann (1992b; 1994). Stegemann sees Qumran as belonging to a wide-spread Essene movement.
4. The Sadducean hypothesis, as proposed by Schiffman (1995).⁸⁵

However, using an inductive method, the question of the designation of the community as Essene or differences and similarities between the classical Essenes and the Qumran community is rather unimportant for my purpose.

The 'library' of this group was quite large with books of different genres. The Qumran manuscripts may in fact be divided into three main groups, i.e. biblical, sectarian and non-sectarian, in addition to unidentified writings (Schiffman 1995:34). Accordingly, there are difficulties in painting a homogenous picture of one single group by a synthesis of all these documents, difficulties that may be explained by the historical development of the group, if not also by their bibliophilism. Some kind of evaluation of what texts are appropriate from my point of view is therefore necessary.

Newsom (1990:173) argues that one should look not only for the authorship of the text to see if it belonged to the community in a strict sense, but that one should also consider whether it was likely that the group used and accepted a manuscript. Schiffman (1995:34) argues that specific documents of the Qumran community constitute 115 works distinguished by references to the community, practices and organisation, history and self-image, theological views and specific biblical interpretations. Stegemann (1994:148) limits the numbers of writings that he thinks are undoubtedly from the Essenes themselves, following similar criteria as those essential to Schiffman. These are of two kinds:

1. Books concerning the study of the Law, the prophets and other traditional writings, and
2. writings giving us information concerning their history, piety, organisation, and relationship to others outside their group.

⁸⁵ There are several variants of such theories, in addition to other and less serious ones that have been flourishing and keep turning up. See VanderKam (1994:23ff) and Vermes (1975:xxx-xxxi) on alternative 'wild' theories.

These most typical ‘sectarian’ writings may also be identified through their palaeographical style,⁸⁶ as well as by DNA analysis of each parchment to find which manuscripts belong together biologically. The first edition of the War Scroll (1QM) is in this way excluded as a central community writing due to the carbon 14 dating (Stegemann 1994:145ff).

I shall follow Talmon (1994:8) who defines seven documents as ‘foundation documents’. These foundation documents are:

1. The Rule of the Community or the Serek (1QS),
2. the Rule of the Congregation or the Messianic Rule (1Q28a/1QSa),
3. the Damascus Document (CD),
4. the Pesher to Habakkuk (1QpHab),
5. the War Scroll (1QM),
6. the Hôdayot (1QH) (at least to some extent), and
7. the Temple Scroll (11QT).⁸⁷

These foundation documents have in common that they all seem to address themselves directly to the members of a group. Other texts may be drawn in, but it makes the comparison with John more fruitful when concentrating on the ‘sectarian’ texts in a stricter way. To some degree, the *Miqṣat Ma‘ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)⁸⁸ may also be brought in as a comparison text although its origin remains quite uncertain. My conclusions shall therefore be drawn primarily from these documents although other documents are included. Stegemann (1992a:181) argues that the Temple Scroll (11QT) may be ‘pre-sectarian’ and in order to weaken the necessary hypothetical character of any such basis for the characteristics of the community, I have

⁸⁶ As the Israeli scholar E. Tov argues, see Cryer, Høgenhaven and Doudna (1997:227–228).

⁸⁷ Several of these writings have been identified in several Qumran manuscripts from three caves, see Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:551ff). The two manuscripts, which were first found in Cairo, are now called Manuscript A (CD–A) and Manuscript B (CD–B). The connection between the Cairo and the Qumran manuscripts raises several textual problems that are not interesting from my point of view. I am following the order in Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997).

⁸⁸ ‘Some of the works of the law’, 4QMMT/4QHalakhic Letter, a composite text of several fragments, 4Q394–399, see Martínez and Tigchelaar (1998:790ff); Qimron and Strugnell (1994).

focused particularly on CD and on some essential details concerning transference of the temple images in the Rule of the Community (1QS 9:3–6). 1QS is a document that has served as core document in the scholarly understanding of the group and which I will use in like manner, although other manuscripts probably belonging to the Serek are also evaluated. In opposition to other documents, such as the Temple Scroll, the Rule of the Community presents itself as belonging to a particular group.⁸⁹

If we look at these central Qumran writings and treat them as presenting a unity, we see, in contrast to for instance the Gospel of John, that in several *direct* ways they present a community or an organised group behind the texts. The most important presentation is their self-designation the Yaḥad יה"ה—often translated with ‘the community’, and in the Old Testament/Tanak only found in Deut 33:5 and 1 Chr 12:18.⁹⁰ The designation has other possible translations such as a ‘gathering or entire number’ (Koehler and Baumgartner 1958), a ‘union’ (Stegemann 1992b:83), but also meanings such as a ‘guild’ or ‘association’. E. Christiansen (1995:6, n. 21) calls it ‘a self-designation with ecclesiological overtones’ when used in the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁹¹

There seem to be two different tendencies among Qumran scholars regarding inclusiveness versus exclusiveness of the group. On the one hand, there is the traditional view with its revisions (as Sukenik and Martínez, see above) that looks upon the group as living in seclusion or segregated in one or another way (often called ‘sectarian’ in a substantial meaning). On the other hand, there is a new conclusion, represented by scholars like Stegemann and Schiffman, who see the group behind the texts as part of a larger movement.⁹² To argue for an Essene theory does not necessarily mean to argue for a very segregated community, as the example of Stegemann demonstrates, but the traditional Essene theory of Qumran does

⁸⁹ See also Weinfeld (1986:14), Hengel (1974a:244) and earlier works such as Ringren (1995:201) who uses 1QS and CD as his basis.

⁹⁰ In the Qumran writings, it is described particularly in 1QS, 1QM and CD. See e.g. 1QS 3:2; 5:1–2 and the presentation in Vermes and Goodman (1989:7ff).

⁹¹ Her definition of ‘ecclesiology’ is quite broad, not referring to a Christian ‘ekklesia’, but rather ‘a ‘community’, or ‘church’ where members see themselves as ‘having both a horizontal relationship to each other and a vertical relationship as a group with God’ (E. Christiansen 1995:2).

⁹² Perhaps also including theories as found in Golb (1995), see above.

operate with such a strong segregation assumption. Nevertheless, this discussion is relevant for my general discussion concerning the social character typical for the communities behind the Gospel of John, Philo, and Qumran writings that focus on the relational aspects of these groups. A comparison between the attitudes towards the temple and temple related issues in Qumran and similar issues in John and Philo, may throw light on aspects in the evaluation of the group behind the Qumran writings as well.

The Community Rule or the Serek ha-Yahad is called 'one of the most important [writings]' (Knibb 1987:77) as well as the 'constitution of the Qumran community' (VanderKam 1994:57). It is the text most referred to when discussing the role of the temple in the community (Gärtner 1965; Klinzing 1971; Evans 1992; O. Betz 1993). Martínez (1994:3–32) identified and translated 12 readable manuscripts of the text, the largest and best preserved from cave 1 (1QS).⁹³ I shall focus on the nature of the self-presentation in the Serek. The temple attitudes in CD are also interesting, but only as explanatory background (see the reference to the discussion in P. Davies mentioned above); discussing the attitudes of CD towards the temple, we should perhaps rather speak of these attitudes as reflecting the 'Damascus community'.

In the Serek, the text clearly presents an understanding of its addressees as a group; it is written for several persons. 1QS 5:1–2 says, 'This is the rule for the men of the Community . . .' (=Yahad) and 'They should keep apart from the congregation of the men of injustice in order to constitute a Community in law and possessions, etc.'. Generally, their initial procedures, organisational pattern, and penal code all point in the same direction, e.g. 1QS 6:13b–23a (Weinfeld 1986). All texts mentioning the segregation and separation are also indicators of the group-consciousness of the Yahad.

A similar attitude is also present in CD and in 4QMMT. The Damascus Document says: '... to keep apart from the sons of the pit . . .' (CD 6:14b–15a) and CD 3:19 speaks of the community as a house or home: 'And he built for them a safe home in Israel' (ויבן להם בית נאמן בישראל). The 'safe home' or 'sure house' (1 Samuel

⁹³ On translations and commentaries on 1QS, see Burrows (1951; 1956:371ff); Brownlee (1951); Carmignac (1956); Carmignac and Guilbert (1961); Milik (1951; 1960); Wernberg-Møller (1957); O'Connor (1969); Lohse (1971); Pouilly (1976); Puech (1979a; 1979b); Schiffman (1989); Charlesworth (1994); Klinghardt (1994).

2:35 NRSV 1993) is, however, not necessarily the community itself and does not apply directly to the temple, but could just as well imply that only the community could validly use the temple, see P. Davies (1996:49). Generally then, all their initial procedures, organisational pattern and penal code⁹⁴ point in the same direction: there was a community behind these texts—a community that we might call the Qumran community. 4QMMT may be drawn in as examples of central conflicts between the community and the temple in Jerusalem, but both the CD and also the MMT may perhaps be ‘pre-sectarian’ (for the discussion, see below). Of special importance for the evaluation of the designation of their opponents as ‘sons of darkness’ (see 1QS 1:10; 1QM 1:1) is the dualistic matrix of the two spirits in 1QS 3:13ff, particularly 3:17b–4:1. This designation seems to function as a boundary marker and demonstrates the division between themselves and their opponents, thus indicating, if not isolation, at least some degree of segregation.

The contents and addressee of their protest will be discussed further down, at this point only the fact that they protested shall be evaluated. This fact, combined with the collective and plural references, indicate that such a group existed, but protest did not seem to lead them to a total isolation to one single locale. They were spread around, a fact clearly demonstrated by 1QS 6:1b–2: ‘In this way shall they behave in all their places of residence’ (cf. *בְּכֹל מְנוֹרֵיהֶם* ‘in all their places of residence’). This might also be in accordance with the testimony of the Damascus Document, e.g. CD 12:19 that speaks of a rule for the assembly of the *cities* (*עָרִים*) of Israel. Thus, the assumption that the Damascus Document was meant for the dispersed Essene groups, while the Serek was only meant for the inhabitants of a Qumran ‘monastery’ (e.g. Schürer 1986:575), can no longer be ascertained. First person singular references are few in 1QS, but some are found in poetry as in the psalm of 1QS 9–10 pointing to a cultic *Sitz im Leben*, and 1QS 11:2b says that ‘As for me, to God belongs my judgement; in his hand is the perfection of my behaviour with the uprightness of my heart’. The general impression is, nevertheless, that the Rule of the Community is a manuscript that reflects a history of a collective in a stronger way than the impression we gain from the Gospel of John.

⁹⁴ Cf. 1QS 6:13b–23a, see Weinfeld (1986).

Other texts indicate in like manner that the Yaḥad had many different camps (מחנות), thus reflecting a larger movement, see CD 7:6 that says ‘and if they reside in the camps in accordance with the rule of the land, and take women and beget children, they shall walk in accordance with the law *etc.*’ One of them might have been at Qumran, but of all these camps, Jerusalem was the main camp; this is stated several time in 4QMMT. 4Q394, 8, 2:10–12 also claims:

Jerusalem is the holy camp, it is the place which he has chosen from among all the tribes of [Israel, since] Jerusalem is the head of the ca[m]ps of Israel],

demonstrating the importance of Jerusalem in this writing and at the same time illustrating a kind of integration of the authors with the socio-cultural surroundings at that time. The importance of Jerusalem explains why Philo and Josephus do not mention ‘Qumran’ at all—only ‘Essenes’ (see Beall 1988:48f). It also explains why Josephus in Bell. 5:145, might be testifying that a whole quarter of Jerusalem belonged to the Essenes, perhaps attached to a gate with the name of the group.⁹⁵ Stegemann (1992b:136) refers to these arguments above and points in addition to the fact that there are other designations for the locale of the group within the CD as well, indicating different stages of development.

We may conclude that a short glance at some texts found in Qumran strongly indicates that there was a community behind them and strengthens the hypothesis of the existence of a community probably living nearby. This community, the Yaḥad, seems to have been a group segregated in some way from other people. Regardless of the theories on the origin of the writings and the group behind the Serek, the core Qumran manuscripts present to us a group with fairly distinct traits. These traits are the best arguments for the existence of a group behind the text and they make the existence of a particular community probable, a community using these texts as

⁹⁵ Concerning the walls around the city, Josephus says ‘In the other direction going towards the west and starting from the same place, it stretched down through the place called Beso to the gate of Essenes’ (ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑσσηνῶν πύλιν) (Bell. 5:145, quoted from Vermes and Goodman 1989: ad loc, in a volume that discusses the classical sources concerning the Essenes). This is also in accordance with recent archaeological excavations, see the notes in Esler (1994:78), but we must remember that the phrase does not demonstrate that there actually was a quarter corresponding to the name of that gate.

their guide, i.e. a Serek community or the Yaḥad. This argument may be supported by archaeological evidence, granted that we accept there being a connection between the ruins and the caves at Qumran. Both the ruins at Qumran today and many of the surrounding caves have traces of habitation. Nearby the ruins, a possible tent-site has been discovered, and about 1200 tombs of both male and female bodies have been located. The scrolls could therefore be linked to a community of the site on archaeological grounds as well.⁹⁶

However, until now, there has been no concrete archaeological or textual evidence from a community of Essenes demonstrating a connection between them and the Qumran caches. One of the arguments of the opponents to seeing the people of Qumran as the source of the writings is the lack of any textual material found at the site. An ostrakon has been found that shows traces of the name יַחַד, and in that case, it strengthens the assumption that the community of the scrolls was an Essene settlement.⁹⁷ This argument tends to strengthen further the hypothesis that there existed not only a Serek community but also a community at Qumran that was responsible for the manuscripts, and that these groups were one and the same or part of the same movement. Any such identification between the Qumran scrolls and the Essenes would surely reinforce the basis for a comparison like the one I have undertaken here.

As was the case with Philo, the Qumran material also touches upon issues similar to the ones found in the Gospel of John, i.e. the temple relationship and social relations seen in the attitudes towards 'outsiders'.

3.5 THREE COMPARABLE COMMUNITIES

The aim of the above presentation was to see if, and possibly in what way, we are justified in saying that there was a Johannine community, i.e. a 'qualified group' and not just a general audience or

⁹⁶ The same type of pottery is found in the caves and in the ruins, and this type pottery is not found outside Qumran. On these archaeological matters, see Martínez and Barrera (1995:8–9).

⁹⁷ Reported by Cross and Eshel (1997). From the photos distributed on the Internet, it is difficult to tell whether the letters really represent Yaḥad. There have been serious objections to this reading, cf. Elgvin (1997); Cryer, Høgenhaven and Doudna (1997).

‘a plain group’. Above all, it is important to see that this quest for the existence of a Johannine community must not be confused with the quest for its social nature or its general relationship to other Christians. Even if there was a qualified group behind this writing, it was *not* necessarily a ‘sectarian’ group or part of an esoteric body of ‘sectarian’ communities.

With the distinction ‘plain group’ vs. ‘qualified group’ in mind, there is not much evidence for the existence of a ‘qualified group’ participating in the production of the Gospel in an interactive way, although there are some indications of group activities. We find redactional comments, collective terms and theological statements that may retrospectively be read as ecclesiological messages. Above all, we find anachronistic allusions to an expulsion from a local synagogue. The basis for this conclusion is strengthened by a comparison with 1 Jn, at least if we accept a close connection between the Gospel and the Epistle. Nevertheless, compared to the evidence of the alleged groups behind the Pauline and other letters of the New Testament, the insecure character of the Johannine evidence for a highly organised background group becomes apparent. Therefore, the assumption of its existence cannot be based upon ‘empirical’ studies of the text only, but derives from a chosen perspective as well—our hermeneutic position or meta-reflection.⁹⁸ The dyadic character of all personalities in pre-modern times is also a fact that has to be considered in this connection. These reflections and the collective terminology do make the existence of a particular community probable, even the existence of a qualified group interacting with the Gospel. However, we must bear in mind the hypothetical character of the assumption.

The theory of the ‘lone genius’ may also be combined with the theory of a group of one or another kind. Bultmann (1971:10–11) differentiated between an ‘evangelist’ responsible for a preceding version of the Gospel and an ‘ecclesiastical editor’ in order to handle two specific problems: the original order of the text, as the order of Jn 5 and 6, and redactional influence on certain passages such as Jn 21 and individual explanatory glosses as 3:24; 4:2; 18:9, 32—which all demonstrate a tendency that ‘shows features that heighten

⁹⁸ See Fiorenza (1989:21) who describes the historical scientific language as metaphorical-constructive.

the ecclesiastical interests', as Bultmann put it. By referring to an 'evangelist' or to 'John' one might also simply refer to the person who finished and 'published' the Gospel.⁹⁹ The essential point is that the existence of such a publisher and even one single and particular author cannot be used to the exclusion of the existence of a community. Hengel (1993), who argues that the 'Elder John' is the author, explains the relation between the single author and his school by stating that '... ich glaube nicht, dass Kollektive in der Antike ohne einen Kopf als spiritus rector wirklich kreativ waren' (1993:3). If we turn Hengel's argument around a little, we may also say that arguments in favour of one author cannot automatically be taken as arguments for claiming that there was no school or community. If there was a community it probably had a leader. There is no necessary contradiction between the thesis saying there was a single author and the thesis claiming there was an author and a community with which the author communicated.

A comparison with the perspective in texts from Philo and Qumran does not help us much in a historical quest for the existence of a Johannine community but the comparisons broaden our perspective of alternative organisations. We might call the community behind the Qumran texts, the *Yahad*, particularly evident behind the Serek and texts with similar traits. The 'Philo community' is, on the other hand, a more difficult notion, but it might be used as a designation to denote the synagogal milieu of Alexandria that identified themselves with the social and religious values as described directly and indirectly by Philo. There is historically undeniable information on his central position in the Jewish community of Alexandria and there is no reason to doubt that in several questions he pronounces common views, regardless of the question whether he had formed a particular school or community himself.

Nevertheless, a comparison between these three text-corpora reveals that 'community' is a designation that takes different meanings when applied to the social milieu behind these three text-corpora. All three notions, the 'Johannine community', the 'Qumran community', and the 'Philo community' have different connotations. The Qumran writings are the texts with the best indications of a background-

⁹⁹ See Hartman (1989:70, n. 4). Barrett (1978:4) refers to the 'main process of editing (to which the name 'John' may for convenience be attached) etc.'.

organised entity, a community, especially seen through the prescriptive genre of the Serek. Then comes the Gospel of John that despite its anonymous character is a text where a particular community is presented through the indications of a dynamic relationship between text and community. However, not every passage in John can be taken to demonstrate the second level in details and to assume the existence of a Johannine community does not necessarily generate overinterpretations and contingent allegory-like exegesis. The assumption of a Philo community is almost as plausible as that of a Johannine community. Philo wrote texts that in one way present a group with a high level of organisation (the Jewish Alexandrians in their *politeia*) and also a community struggling against enemies and persecution, while at the same time being a part of Judaism in a broad sense. The writings of Philo are not prescriptions as we have seen from the Qumran writings, but as with John, some of them do bear witness to a process of being created or moderated within a community and reflect its particular experiences.

CHAPTER FOUR

JOHN AND THE TEMPLE

4.1 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TEMPLE THEME

4.1.1 *Impossible to Make Too Much of the Temple*

There is a scholarly consensus that the temple in Jerusalem with its cultus and other religious and social functions was the central Jewish institution of the time in Palestine as well as abroad, before its destruction.¹ The notion ‘Second Temple period’ is indicative for the general judgement of its importance, and it is ‘almost impossible to make too much of the Temple in first-century Jewish Palestine’ (E. P. Sanders 1993:262).²

This is a common judgement today that neither implies that the study of Judaism in the first century CE is complete by an analysis of the temple cultus nor means that the adherence to the temple worship in Jerusalem constituted an orthodoxy or orthopraxy for all those who defined themselves as ‘Jews’.³ Nevertheless, despite the multiplicity of directions, opinions and groups among Jews during the Second Temple period, despite alternative and partly competing temples present and past in Leontopolis, at Elephantine on the Nile

¹ Cf. the description of the temple as centre by numerous scholars such as Segal (1986:38–40); Bilde (1990:38ff); Borg (1984:163ff); Schürer (1979:2:227–313). Segal (1986:39) argues that the temple was especially central to government since the priesthood from the sixth century through the end of the first century became the highest and most stable political power. Cf. Jeremias (1967:75); Chilton (1992:155).

² Several scholars have taken the centrality of the temple as their starting point or as one of them (Busse 1997:398), cf. Trocmé (1968–69:2, n. 1); Kerr (2002). Motyer (1997:36ff) argues that the use of the temple and the festivals in the Gospel narrative are essential for our understanding of it.

³ See the above-mentioned discussion between Aune (1976) and McEleney (1973; 1978). Other themes could have been included as well, such as monotheism, the question of an elect people, Torah, and land—themes that may be called ‘pillars’ of Judaism (Dunn 1991:18ff). They functioned as ‘axiomatic convictions round which the more diverse interpretations and practices of the different groups within Judaism revolved’ (Dunn 1991:35). Jaffe (1996) concludes that ‘Judaism in this period was exhausted neither by the Temple cult nor the historical, theological, and legal traditions reflected in the scriptural canon’, cf. Grabbe (1996:xi–xii).

(5th and 2nd century BCE), and also Gerizim, the Jerusalem temple was doubtless what we today would call a religious, cultural and social centre for most Jews.⁴ One essential theological feature connected to the temple seems to have been

its function as focus of the holy land of covenant premise, the place which God has appointed as the primary expression of his presence on earth (Dunn 1991:57).

E. P. Sanders (1985:64) takes Josephus to demonstrate that the primary function of the temple was sacrifice (Josephus *Antiq.* 15:248; *Bell.* 2:409–410). However, the social functions of this institution cannot be isolated to theological ideas or statements concerning sacrificial functions that would imply an ideological reductionism. The other functions are obvious and in a sociological description, a broadening of the perspective is compulsory. Judaism at the time was what we today would call a ‘political religion’. The temple was the administrative centre (Segal 1986:39), it functioned as the map for social relations, it was the centre of the political economy and with its large treasures and storehouses, and it was also almost like a national bank and storage depot (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:77). It was a meeting place for the Sanhedrin, i.e. the civil and religious governing body, it served the function of study and teaching of the Law, the function of repository of funds and, in times of siege, the function of a citadel (Nickelsburg and Stone 1983:62–63).⁵ The wide range of functions is also reflected in the Gospel of John and any discussion of these matters has to reflect the multi-layered functions or aspects of the temple. The centrality of the temple in first century Judaism is also essential for an evaluation of the ‘sectarian’ claim,

⁴ Together with the Jerusalem temple the (rest of the) temple on Gerizim was destroyed by the Romans in 70 CE according to Josephus *Bell.* 3:307–315. See also the references to the earlier destruction of the temple by John Hyrcanus in Josephus *Antiq.* 13:254–258 and *Bell.* 1:62 as well as his references to the Jewish-Samaritan conflict in *Antiq.* 12:10. On the Jewish temple in Leontopolis and other places, see *Antiq.* 13:65–70. On the Onias temple at Elephantine, see *Bell.* 1:33; 7:421ff; *Antiq.* 12:387–388 and my comments on this temple in connection with Philo’s temple relationship below. Both ‘religion’, ‘culture’ and ‘social’ (and several other notions in use) are modern notions with similar types of problems as the ones connected to the use of ‘sect’.

⁵ Other non-biblical functions are described in Hartman (1989), cf. Dunn (1991:31–33). Theissen (1999:151ff) introduces general theories of sacrifice, functions that the new religion (Christianity) had to replace with the fall of the Jerusalem temple.

since with the temple as a centre, the description of groups as ‘sectarian’ finds a *firm* ground; it is an institution in relation to which one might be ‘sectarian’.

4.1.2 *The Destruction of the Temple and the Johannine Community*

The temple of Jerusalem was evidently destroyed by the time of the final version of the Gospel, a fact that disturbs the analysis of John as ‘sectarian’ in relation to the temple. Nevertheless, the role of the temple was *not* outplayed among Jews by its destruction, and also because of its central position in the Gospel, the significance of the temple in John cannot simply be disregarded.

While the temple and temple related features are central in John, the destruction of the temple is also evidently alluded to in Jn 4:21, but also in 11:48.⁶ This is a simple state of fact without any claim that such passages represent a plain vaticinium ex eventu, although one may argue that the reason for the preservation of the prophecy probably was that the temple actually had been destroyed. Jn 4:21 presents a statement with stress on the lack of place of worship that is unparalleled in the gospels; a straightforward historical reading suggests that the temple was already destroyed when these lines were written down. Destroyed, the temple’s traditional sacrificial cultus was made impossible, but nevertheless, it still must have played a *major* role also after that. Although some rabbinical traditions thought it unnecessary to rebuild the temple, others do bear witness to a hope for a new temple.⁷ Reconstruction of the temple was attempted

⁶ In contrast to the conclusion of K. Berger (1997:84ff). K. Berger uses the lack of replacement statements in 4:20–23 as an argument for John being the first gospel written, but as I shall argue below, the actual destruction of the temple cannot be taken to say that Jews and Christians had abandoned the temple as an institution. Evidently, statements predicting the temple destruction also have a context before 70 CE (E. P. Sanders 1985:87). It is difficult to conclude that 4:21 demonstrates that the temple had been destroyed, but the idea is of course not strained despite the present form of εἰμί (about the place of worship) in 4:20. Together with 4:23 and its curious expression ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν the allusions in 11:48 suggest at least that the temple had been destroyed by the Romans when the Gospel was written down. Concerning 11:48, see Barrett (1978:405–406) and Brown (1979:49–51) contra K. Berger (1997:87).

⁷ Such a hope may be seen from Shemoneh Esreh, the fourteenth of the eighteen ‘Benedictions’, see Simon (1950:247); Brown (1966:122–123). There are many reasons to think that temple adherent Jews looked upon the lack of a cultus location as an interim period (Klinzing 1971:166). In the two alternatives outlined by Motyer (1997:74–104; 2001:91–92), R. Johanan ben Zakkai was not favourable to

both during the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–35 CE) and later by pagan emperor Julian Apostata in 363 CE, and sacrifices were probably undertaken. While this was probably part of the tactics of the emperor to discredit Christians, it is obvious from these observations alone that the question of the temple restoration was not generally ignored.⁸ It is important to remember that we can hardly speak of a dominant rabbinical Judaism that had redefined Judaism according to the situation without temple before well into the third century. We should also keep in mind that in addition to mainstream Christianity and rabbinical Judaism, there were also other attempts to redefine the heritage of Second Temple Judaism, seen in writings such as 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch (see Dunn 1991:232–234). The actual destruction of the temple in 70 CE naturally changed the situation in the long run, as the Jews no longer could celebrate and attend the traditional temple cultus. Nevertheless, with a wide range of reactions to the new situation without the temple in Jewish groups, and since most Jews seemed to have expected the temple to be rebuilt even with Roman help (Goodman 1994), we cannot take for granted, *a priori*, that the temple idea was immediately abandoned.⁹

Consequently, we cannot simply presuppose that the overthrow in 70 CE led to an immediate departure of the temple institution by emerging Jewish-Christian groups. We may ask what the Johannine community would have thought about the temple and what they would have done, if the temple buildings had not been destroyed? The Gospel bears witness not only to the result of the process towards

rebuild the temple. Irenaeus and Jerome also testify to an enduring yearning for the Jerusalem temple among Jewish Christians, but Brown (1994:452) points to the fact that they probably understood the yearning symbolically, not literally. See also Stone (1981) concerning references to post-temple reactions.

⁸ Some Jews were eager to rebuild the temple while others, the patriarch and the rabbis of Galilee, were sceptical, see *Lam. Rab.* 1:17–19a. See Armstrong (1996:194–196) on the events in connection with Julian.

⁹ See the recent and fine presentation of Jewish responses to the fall of the temple in Kerr (2002:34ff). Already Wenschkewitz (1932:28) refers to rabbinical sources in order to demonstrate the imminent expectation of a restoration of the temple among the Jews, particularly as seen in the Seventeenth Benediction (he quotes from Strack 1915). Klinzing (1971:166) argues similarly that the Qumran situation resembles or anticipates the Jewish situation after the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, with the exception that the Torah then became the essential feature in Judaism. The situation also resembles the situation for the Samaritans at the time after the destruction of their temple (128 BCE), but again the destruction of a temple cannot be seen as a destruction of all its social functions. Probably too, the Samaritans could sacrifice without a temple, see Theissen (1999:346, n. 3).

the end written product, but also to the process itself—according to the two-level reading. In addition, we cannot exclude the possibility that the situation for the Johannine Christians shortly after (i.e. 70–100 CE) the destruction of the temple was similar to the situation *before* the destruction, regarding their relationship and attitudes to the temple institution as such.

The approach leading to such considerations is a wide institutional approach.¹⁰ It renders a broad orientation necessary towards temple attitudes seen in the statements of the texts also after the significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus was made explicit in Christian theology generally or soteriology specifically,¹¹ but also after the actual destruction of the temple by the Romans. It is an approach that focuses on the social significance of the temple institution rather than criticism of its meaning only. In the centre of my discussion is the prevalent replacement theory concerning the relationship of the community and temple Judaism, postulating that Jesus had occupied the role of the Jerusalem temple in one way or another, either by himself or by his believing communities after his death. I have tried to identify different temple replacement or supersession theories among Johannine scholars, whether they are working sociologically or not. A social scientific approach focusing on the second level of the Gospel (past events and present situation), may in fact lay to rest many, but not all, of the questions related to the historical Jesus and theological replacement theories about the situation in the early church.

Another prominent institution of the Jews according to the Gospel of John was the synagogue.¹² The Gospel reports a partly tense situation of Jesus in connection with the temple,¹³—but in connection

¹⁰ This notion of 'institution' and the definition of 'objective status' are in accordance with definitions given by P. Berger and Luckmann (1967) where every kind of social routinisation is an institution in nucleo, cf. Luckmann (1992:149).

¹¹ Compare with statements in Rom 3:25; 1 Jn 2:2; 4:10 and the evaluation of their significance for doctrine of atonement in Hengel (1981). On the centrality of Christology in John, see the recent contributions by M. de Jonge (2000) and Früwald-König (1998).

¹² Safrai (1987:904ff), with a primary basis on later Jewish sources (i.e. after the first century), argues that the importance of the temple and the worship in forms of sacrificial rites did not form the sole element in the religious life of Israel, but that the synagogues and the *bet midrash* also played an important role. Nevertheless, the central role of the temple is underlined by the fact that these institutions became associated with the temple and drew their authority from it, according to Safrai.

¹³ Malina and Rohrbaugh are correct when they point to Jn 8:59 and 11:56 as demonstrating hostility between 'temple personnel' and Jesus (1998:74).

with the synagogue the reported tension is more or less devastating according to ejection places (9:22; 12:42; 16:2; see chapter 3). Granted the main position of the temple in Judaism at the time before its destruction and its massive presence in the Gospel of John, it turns out to be of vital interest in studying how the relationship towards the temple as reflected in the Gospel may affect the evaluation of the potential 'sectarian' characteristics of the Johannine community as well. To my knowledge, this relationship has not been studied in connection with the community before.¹⁴

The questions invoked by much of the earlier temple replacement theories in non-sociological investigations of the Gospel take us close to the questions posed by the sociological 'sect' models: What kind of change is the group aiming at, a total revolutionary turn-over, some novel and supplementing ideas or refurbishing elements? I shall demonstrate how many studies take us close to these questions, but fail to see the importance of the social dimensions. One of the questions that the sociological models of 'sect' urge us to ask is the degree of social tension involved in such a relationship. As pointed out above, sociologists have found that tension between 'sects/cults' and the overall society in the modern world materialises in elements like claimed difference, antagonism, and separation (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:49). In my evaluation of the temple passages in John, I shall analyse the degree of tensions by applying these three elements. Tension must not be confused with neglect of or abrogation with the temple institution in such a way that if you find tension, you will also find neglect. The question of degree leads us to ask if *all* aspects of the temple institution were looked upon as in need of change or just *some*, and how important they were. We should not look for 'ideological destruction' alone, but also for possible consequences when it comes to social patterns of behaviour. Consequently, we should evaluate the degree of tension involved by analysing differences on theoretical grounds and their social consequences, possible antagonisms involved, and finally possible traces of isolation that are witnessed by the Gospel.

¹⁴ Lieu (1999) analyses the function of 'temple' and 'synagogue' in John in relation to the development of the Johannine community, but without discussing these features in relation to sociological models, cf. the similar procedure in Kerr (2002).

4.2 TYPES OF TEMPLE REFERENCES IN JOHN

References to the temple and temple related issues in the Gospel of John are manifold compared to the Synoptics. The temple buildings are mentioned several times and so are pilgrim festivals and Jerusalem.¹⁵ The word for ‘mount’ (τὸ ὄρος) is not applied, but 4:20–21 presents Jerusalem in connection with the Samaritan temple on mount Gerizim. The word ‘Gerizim’ is likewise not employed, but the Samaritan mount is clearly indicated (contra Marsh 1968:220). The Jerusalem temple itself (τὸ ἱερόν), probably including the surrounding area and the buildings, is referred to in several places: in 2:13–22 in connection with the ‘temple cleansing’ and one of the Passover celebrations, in Jn 7 with the festival of Booths (7:14, 28), in Jn 8 in connection with the stated fact that Jesus taught at the temple (8:20, 59),¹⁶ in Jn 10 with the festival of Dedication (10:23), and in Jn 11 where the presentation of the last Passover of Jesus commences (11:56 and again in 18:20). We see that in these sections the Jerusalem temple is generally connected to three different named festivals: the festival of Passover, of Dedication, and of Booths. In addition, the Gospel mentions an unknown festival in 5:1, probably also connected to the temple (cf. 5:14). The general view on the temple in the community may also be derived from passages that merely mention the Passover, such as 6; 11; 13–19. Compared to the Synoptics, the Gospel of John also gives a prominent place to the temple cleansing, i.e. at the beginning of Jesus’ ministry. In the subsequent section, I shall categorise all these temple references in John. The importance of the temple theme is generally accepted, although I think some scholars are too eager to find allusions to hidden references

¹⁵ The temple, Mount Zion and the city of Jerusalem are often equated in the Prophets (Isa 1:26–27; 60:14; Jer 50:28; 51:10–11). See the discussion in E. P. Sanders (1985:77–78, 86) who follows McKelvey (1969) against Gaston (1970), arguing that there was a background for the temple destruction saying also before 70 CE. If Jerusalem and the temple are equated in this way, any presence in the city would imply that the author supported the temple. If this was the case, it means that the first Christians stayed in Jerusalem *in order to* be able to sacrifice (Dunn 1991:58). An interesting conclusion, but its hypothetical character is rather evident since the temple also served other functions.

¹⁶ The reference in Jn 8:2 is not estimated due to the secondary status of the passage 7:53–8:11 (omitted in $\mathfrak{P}^{66, 75}$, $\mathfrak{S}$ et al.) see Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos et al. (1993:273). For other references, see chapter 6.

and meanings.¹⁷ Generally, there is also a tendency to read too much rejection of the temple into John, as I shall argue.

In addition to the temple being noticeably present in the Johannine text, the festival theme connected to the temple theme also seems to be woven into the structure of the Gospel. The whole Gospel may be divided into five main parts (Barrett 1978:11–15):

1. The prologue 1:1–18,
2. the public ministry of Jesus 1:19–12:50 ('the book of signs'),
3. Jesus alone with his disciples (or the first part of the 'the book of glory') 13:1–17:26,
4. passion and resurrection 18:1–20:31, and
5. the epilogue 22:1–25.¹⁸

One whole sub-part of the Gospel, Jn 5–10, may be arranged topically according to its references to Jewish feasts and/or festivals (Brown 1966:CXXXVIII–CXLIII), and this unit may again be subdivided by references to the principal feasts and the Sabbath. Other holy places are specified as well, but these passages lie outside the scope of this investigation.¹⁹

¹⁷ On symbolism in John, see also Olsson (1974); Kieffer (1987:12 et al.); Culpepper (1987:180ff). Is there a hidden reference to the symbolism of darkness when John tells that Nicodemus came to Jesus 'by night' (3:2), and similarly in 13:30 in connection with Judas (Culpepper 1987:192)? Jn 9:4 and 11:10 indicate a symbolic understanding of *vóξ* and it is of course possible to transpose a similar meaning to the stories of Nicodemus and Judas, too. The depiction of Nicodemus is, however, quite positive in contrast to the one of Judas (7:50; 19:39), a fact that should warn us against too many hidden meanings. In addition, in Jn 21:3, *vóξ* is used in a neutral way. Busse (1997) and Yee (1989) see too many hidden symbolic references. Likewise, McCaffrey's (1988) spiritual reading of Jn 14:2 ('in my Father's house') can hardly be used to say that the Jerusalem temple is completely spiritualised by John.

¹⁸ The second part is also called the 'the book of signs' and the third and fourth part together is called the 'book of glory', see Dodd (1953:289); Brown (1966:CXXXVIII); Burge (1992). The possibility of a topical arrangement strengthens the theory that the Gospel has been pieced together to form a unified narrative; it reflects a composition of successive redactions. This is a common theory of the genesis of this Johannine writing—of course with several variants, see for instance Barrett (1978:4) and Burge (1992).

¹⁹ These are Bethel (Jn 1:51), specific Samaritan holy places (Jn 4), Bethzatha (Jn 5), and the pool of Siloam (Jn 9). W. Davies (1974:288ff) includes these other holy places in his discussion of the 'land' in the Gospel of John. Jn 2–4 deals with institutions of Judaism other than the temple, i.e. the institution of ritual purification, of a rabbi, and of a holy well (Burge 1992:79).

These multiple references, the structure centred on festival themes and the surprising chronological location of the temple cleansing all make the temple theme a recurrent and essential one that is of special interest from a socio-redactional point of view. The suggested division of the Gospel emphasises issues that are suitable for a study of social characteristics in the community, since the Gospel clearly differentiates between an external public part and an internal private part. This is significant because of the stress on the question of isolation and segregation in 'sectarianism'. The division is also suitable in this connection since it profiles a presentation of the Jewish feasts as one of the central organising principles in the Gospel, and thus marking the question of a temple Judaism as essential for our understanding of the Gospel. Moreover, the structure is interesting because it isolates the prologue and epilogue, passages that are always essential within a redaction-critical approach and for an investigation in quest for the social attitudes of this community.

Of the many references to the temple and temple issues in the Gospel of John, there are certain passages in which the temple is particularly dominating. The most comprehensive sections dealing with the temple are:

1. The discussion of the temple cleansing in 2:13–22,
2. the discussion concerning the role of Jerusalem and Gerizim in the conversation with the Samaritan woman in Jn 4,
3. the discussion concerning the festivals of Tabernacles or Booths in 7:14ff, and
4. the discussion concerning the festival of Dedication in 10:2–42.

My reading of these passages is focused on how these texts may reflect the attitudes of the Johannine community. The picture given by the Gospel describes how Jesus, his disciples, and other followers celebrated the temple festivals and how Jesus went up to Jerusalem several times to celebrate during his ministry on the first and second level. The Judaism presented to us is without a doubt a 'temple Judaism', at least in relation to the story of the historical Jesus. How these features were conceived by the community (second level) in its present and near past situation, is what I shall explore. The many references in themselves also indicate the importance of the temple for the Johannine community, both negatively and positively.

As the relationship of the community to the temple institution is not directly stated, we are dependent on indirect statements on the second level, giving us information leading to analytical conclusions. This means that we shall have to infer the temple relations from statements including the stated practices of Jesus and the disciples in connection with the temple and temple festivals, the editorial comments about the temple or temple related issues, and implicit and explicit traces of a historical development of the community.

An analysis of contents shows that there are three kinds of references to temples and temple related issues and functions in the Gospel of John (further notes below), see also page 196; 225:

1. References to the geographical or temporal temple and temple mounts:
 - a. the Jerusalem temple at mount Zion
 - b. the Samaritan temple at mount Gerizim.
2. References to functions of the temple, sacrifice and worship:
 - a. the Jerusalem temple including cultus, offerings feasts and festivals
 - b. the Samaritan temple.
3. References to a transferred temple and transferred temple related issues:
 - a. the 'body temple' of Jesus
 - b. Jesus as the lamb of God and his life-giving water.

The third category, references to a transferred temple and transferred temple related issues, is without doubt the most interesting one for my investigation, since it describes a relationship between the geographical temple and possible replacements. Generally, a 'transference of the temple' is the phenomenon that takes place when the function and meaning of a geographically located and physical temple are applied to other domains, physical or not. Generally, metaphors, allegories, typologies, or parables are common and literary expressions of non-physical transference.

Scholars have often discussed transference of the temple in connection with the Philo and Qumran writings (cf. chapter 5). A similar temple transference as the one found in John, is also discernible from these writings. The term 'spiritualisation' for this transference is, however, somewhat misleading. We should rather speak of 'rein-

terpretations' in addition to 'transference'.²⁰ The notion 'spiritualisation' should perhaps be limited to the movement found in some places in Philo where the temple and temple offerings are looked upon as transferred to the ideal (Platonic) world, ideas that may be reached through allegorisation.²¹ 'Spiritualisation' may also refer to any non-physical transference of a cultus. The main sociological challenge in our understanding of all past transference of the cultus to other areas is to decide whether the alternative includes or excludes the original cultus or to what degree it may be said to replace the original in a way that also includes actual neglect. Criticism of cultic religion and a support of personal-ethical piety do not necessarily lead to a contrasting practice or neglect, since the temple where cultic religion takes place has multiple aspects and serves a wide range of social functions.²² Therefore, an alternative worship seen in a transference that does not establish a physical alternative cannot necessarily be taken as a complete replacement of the original cultus. Anyway, as Wenschkewitz (1932:9) also argues, although modified, the spiritualisation of the cultus always included an indirect recognition of the original cultus. Sometimes, he argues, the spiritualisation is completed, i.e. it occurs when the original cultus is rejected based on the principle of equivalence. Wenschkewitz differentiates between a reflected (Philo and the later rabbinical literature) and a naive understanding of spiritualisation (the prophets, Psalms, pseudepigraphic

²⁰ As noted for example by Gärtner (1965:18) and McKelvey (1969:47). Klinzing (1971) uses 'Umdeutung'. Dunn (1991:75ff) uses 'transpose' in connection with transposed categories like temple, priesthood, sacrifice, purity rules, Jerusalem etc. in various New Testament writings.

²¹ Cf. Philo in Her. 75–76. Wenschkewitz (1932:6) prefers 'Spiritualisierung' to 'Vergeistigung' because the latter is too closely associated with the modern understanding of sacrifice as an act of self-denial. He also calls it 'Umdeutung'. When scholars today prefer 'transference' to 'spiritualisation', it is to include interpretations of the sacrifice that also could imply alternative animal sacrifice contrasting the mentality in antiquity that thought of sacrifice in a cultic-ritualistic way. I will follow those who take 'spiritualisation' to refer to abstract transference only.

The notion 'spiritualisation' has also been applied in New Testament studies. Riesenfeld (1947:12) defines it as 'une interprétation théologique des rites—ou plutôt des mythes associés aux rites' in the Jewish cultus of the Old Testament, but that the transfiguration of Jesus 'représente une seconde création dans le cadre des anciennes catégories de motifs' (concerning 'de l'Ancien Testament et la fête juive des Tabernacles', Riesenfeld 1947:304–5).

²² Fiorenza (1976) prefers 'transference' because 'spiritualisation' implies an anti-cultic interpretation that is historically misplaced, cf. Kampen (1999:186ff) and below.

and apocryphal literature). He thinks that the New Testament and Christian evidence differs from other transference of the cultus on christological grounds. My task is somewhat different, since my aim is to see if and how the stated transference included a neglect of the temple institution on the part of the Johannine community.

In the Gospel of John, a direct temple transference is found in 2:21 when it is said about Jesus that his body was a temple (cf. ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ). We also find a transference of temple related issues when Jesus is declared to be the Lamb of God (1:29, 36) or when it is said that he possesses the life-giving water (4:10–11; 7:38). There are also several possibly hidden examples, but from my point of view, it is better to see the degree of tension reflected in explicit references to a replacement statement than in allusions.²³ As will be demonstrated, I am rather reluctant to view all the Johannine passages mentioned above as containing transference involving replacement of sociological significance.

4.3 TEMPLE ATTITUDES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT GENERALLY

There are several different statements relating to opposing attitudes in the four gospels in connection with the role of the temple of Jerusalem.²⁴ Much discussion has concentrated on the historical Jesus and his relationship to the temple, particularly connected to the temple act or cleansing (Mk 11:57 et par.) and the prophecy of the temple destruction (Mk 14:58 et par.).²⁵ However, since I am not focusing on the historical Jesus but on the Johannine community, several questions in relation to the quest for the historical Jesus and literary development can be disregarded in this connection. In this short résumé of *major trends* in the New Testament concerning the temple and related issues, I am above all interested in how these texts reflect the reception and understanding in the early church. In addition to

²³ Concealed transference is possibly presented when John alludes to Jesus as a new tabernacle in 1:14 (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν κτλ.). Jesus may also be said to represent a new Bethel or ‘house of God’ in 1:51 by the declarations ascribed to him.

²⁴ Main examples are: Mt 5:34–35; 17:24–27; 23:16–22, 37–39; 27:5–6; Mk 11:15–17, 27; 14:58; 15:38 Lk 1:21–22; 2:41ff; 4:9; 13:34–35; 24:53; Jn 5:1; 7:1–11.

²⁵ See particularly the thorough studies on this subject by Ådna (1993; 2000). See also the article describing his main results (Ådna 1999) and my discussion of his theories and results below.

the Synoptics, the passages in Acts and Hebrews are the writings the most interesting from my point of view. Further New Testament evidence is also partly discussed in more detail below in connection with the context analysis of 2:13–22. Both the general picture of the temple relationship in the early church, and the place of the Johannine community within this picture are much discussed issues. I shall conclude that there are *three* main categories of attitudes and that the Gospel of John does not demonstrate the most negative one.

Schrenk (1965:242) pointed to the undeniable fact that in the New Testament there is a *twofold*-attitude of Jesus towards the temple in Jerusalem that might also reflect the attitudes of the first Christians. Avemarie (1999) discusses the presentation of John the Baptist in the gospels,²⁶ and he concludes convincingly that the Baptist is not presented as holding a critical stance, that he more likely criticised the Essene practice and had become essentially indifferent to the sacrificial cultus of the Jerusalem temple. Hengel (1981:56) argues about the early Christians in Judaea, however, that we ‘have no indication whatsoever’ that they ‘felt an unconditioned obligation to worship on Mount Zion’. According to his conclusion then, there were some Jews who did not find the temple *that* important. Nevertheless, Dunn argues that there is ‘a significant portion of evidence which shows that Jesus had a very positive attitude to the Temple’ (1991:38) and that the first Christians likewise ‘remained very much focused on the Temple’ (1991:57). Likewise, we see that E. P. Sanders also concludes that the Jewish Christians ‘like virtually all other first-century Jews, assumed that there would still be a Temple’ (1993:262). The New Testament evidence should be studied from that perspective.

Luke ends his gospel by declaring that the disciples remained in Jerusalem and ‘were continually in the temple blessing God’ (Lk 24:53). The Gospel of Matthew is very interesting from my point of view. If the Gospel is read as an expression of the practice of a Matthean community, Mt 17:24–27, where Jesus is reported to reluctantly having *accepted* the temple tax, could be regarded as a sign of temple commitment by the Matthean community (Saldarini 1994: 276, n. 86). In addition, Mt 5:23–24 seems to be part of a Christian

²⁶ In Mt 3:7ff, the Baptist is speaking to Pharisees and Sadducees while in Lk 3:7ff he speaks to crowds coming to be baptised by him, and see Mk 11:27ff where the chief priests, scribes and elders are presented as accepting the baptism of John.

catechesis (Dunn 1991:58), and thus an example of the attitude towards the temple also in a post-Easter community. Several scholars question this reading and, admittedly, when Jesus *did* approve to pay the temple tax according to Matthew, his reason is not ideal.²⁷ Schrenk (1965:245) points to the fact that Judas is reported to cast in his money into the temple, thus defiling it (Mt 27:5) and the temple curtain is torn in two, a possible symbolic destruction, see Mk 15:38 et par. Other examples demonstrate a clearly positive attitude towards the temple and related issues. The story and logion in Mk 12:41–44 et par. concerning ‘the widow’s offering’ in principle endorse the temple and its sacrifices. In the story about the lepers that Jesus cleanses in Mk 1:40–44 et par., the lepers are told to go to the priest after having been cleansed. One may read all these statements in connection with Mt 5:17 in the statement by Jesus that he has not come to abolish the Law or the prophets, but to fulfil them.

To avoid the obvious problem these statements cause regarding his conclusion of temple and sacrificial overthrow on christological grounds, Ådna (2000:439) argues that this is the way Jesus looked at the temple during the time *before* the last days. The positive attitude is completely understandable ‘before the Kairos of the fulfilled temple has come’ (‘ehe der Kairos der eschatologischen Erfüllung des Tempels gekommen ist’, see also his general conclusions referred below). Ådna is quite right that the question of the relationship in the early church, including the Johannine community, is a different one, but we cannot for that reason just assume that the positive statements concerning the temple and its sacrifices were traditional material handed over uncritically, especially not in connection with the Gospel of John with all its particularities. The temple relationship of the Johannine community is perhaps the best test case for an evaluation of the general temple relationship of the emerging Christian church. This is evident since the indications of a realised eschatology in John force us to consider the temple relationship in

²⁷ None of the examples from Matthew (Mt 5:23–24; 17:24–27) is, however, in principle negative to the temple institution, as Ådna (2000:437–439) also admits. In accordance with several scholars, Ådna argues that the temple tax passage is not to be read as an acceptance of the temple cultus (see particularly 17:27). See also Hengel (1981:56) who argues that the passage reflects a practice by the first Christians that was introduced in order not to offend the authorities and therefore cannot be looked upon as an endorsement.

a time when Christians had understood that the coming of Jesus was not an immediate event and that the interim period consequently was prolonged indefinitely.

Outside the gospels, the statements of the first Christians regarding the Jerusalem temple and its cultus of sacrifices also reflect ambivalence. This is particularly evident in connection with Paul. Paul is described by Luke as attending the temple and therefore at least to some degree a *temple adherent* (Acts 21:26–30; 22:17; 24:18; 25:8; 26:21). Although not discussing the Gospel of John, E. P. Sanders (1985:76) uses the evidence from Acts to argue that Jesus did not consider the temple impure—if he had, the disciples should have expressed similar ideas. Ådna (1993:556–557) disagrees and argues that what Luke actually meant in Acts 21:26; 24:17 is so unclear that we can only find Paul's own opinion concerning these matters in his letters. The theology of atonement is evident in the letters in a way that renders the idea that Paul supported the temple untenable, according to Ådna (cf. Hengel 1981:55ff). In Rom 6:10, Paul is concerned about sacrificial aspects of the temple, stating that Jesus died for sin, 'once for all' (ἐφάπαξ), an expression that at least implies a disinterest in, if not a rejection of the Jerusalem temple (cf. 1 Pet 3:18). However, the presentation of Paul in Luke's Acts may represent different attitudes towards the temple by some Christians. It might be argued that the description in Acts is a result of a tendency by Luke to describe the earliest churches in stronger continuity with the tradition of old than seems to be the case in the Pauline letters (Dunn 1991:296, n. 1). There are much to say about the use of temple expressions such as ναός in 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16 and Eph 2:21 (cf. 1 Tim 3:15; Heb 3:6; 1 Pet 4:17; Rev 3:12).²⁸ This metaphorical use of ναός follows a pattern found in Greek and Jewish literature, such as Philo, who uses temple metaphors both individually and collectively (cf. Opif. 137 and the comments below as well as my analyses in chapter 5). The use of temple metaphors in 1 Cor has to be seen against the background of pagan temples in Corinth, and is for that reason to be taken as demonstrating substitution of the Jerusalem temple by Paul, as Böttrich

²⁸ These verses are discussed further down, in addition to 1 Pet 2:15. Concerning Rev 21:22 and the lack of temple in the eschatological heaven, see further down.

(1999) argues.²⁹ Siegert (1999) argues that Paul who appeals the readers to present their bodies as a 'living sacrifice', a 'spiritual worship' (λογικὴ λατρεία) through the Christians' daily life and conduct in Rom 12:1, does nothing innovatory, but draws on common Hellenistic Jewish ideas. He supports the idea that worship without sacrifice, in words of prayer, reading and teaching, was created by the diaspora Jews. Generally, these passages do not demonstrate the writer's attitude towards the temple of Jerusalem. To say that a congregation is a temple is *not* to say that the temple of Jerusalem is superseded. These passages are for that reason of minor interest for my sociological discussion. Without trying to solve the problem of the historical relationship between the descriptions of Paul in Acts and the Pauline letters, one may nonetheless say that whatever the intention of Luke was, he also demonstrates a type of positive attitude towards the temple through his picture of Paul in Acts. He shows, thereby, the existence of such attitudes outside the Gospel of John.

Relevant information from Acts concerning the early Christian meetings in private houses has also been used to argue for a rejection of the temple institution by these Jewish-Christians. Acts 2:46; 5:42 states directly that the first Christians *both* met in private houses *and* attended the temple: καθ' ἡμέραν τε προσκαρτεροῦντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, κλῶντές τε κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον κτλ. (2:46a). Nevertheless, Ådna speaks of a 'replacement of the temple cult' ('Ablösung vom Tempelkult') as seen from Acts, arguing that even if they went to the temple, it is not likely that they attended the celebration of the propitiatory sacrifice. He argues that the early church was organised like a synagogue where they celebrated The Lord's Supper in memory of Jesus, a ceremony that he thinks excludes other celebrations. The reports about the first Christians

macht es aber sehr unwahrscheinlich, dass die frühen Christen wie ihre jüdischen Stammverwandten, die den verschiedenen Synagogengemeinschaften in der Stadt angehörten, am Sühnopferkult im Tempel weiterhin teilnahmen (Ådna 1993:554–555).

Acts 5:42b says διδάσκοντες καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν i.e. what they did in the temple as well as in the houses was to

²⁹ Böttrich (1999) studies the Pauline passages 1 Cor 3:16–17, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:19. The epistolary context of these passages demonstrates that Paul uses the expressions connected to the temple in a general way and he concludes that they cannot be seen as contrasting the Jerusalem temple.

teach and proclaim the Messiah Jesus. However, to conclude that they did not attend the sacrifices is an argument from silence. Rightly, the reaction against the preaching was severe (Acts 4:1–3, 5–7; 5:15–16, 27–28, 33), but Acts does not say that they were arrested for being critical of the temple. They proclaimed the saving significance of Jesus (Acts 4:12), but the relationship to the temple is not mentioned in a critical way before Stephen enters the scene in Acts 6–7.

The speech of Stephen in Luke's Acts 7 is highly critical towards the Jerusalem temple as a place for the presence of God (see Larsson 1987; 1993; Dunn 1991:60–71). One may compare the saying in John concerning the body of Jesus as temple with Acts 7:48; 17:24 where Stephen in Jerusalem and Paul in Athens are both reported to deny that the Lord abides in temple(s) made with hands (χειροποίητος). The same expression is also used in Heb 9:11, 24 and in a similar expression on circumcision in Eph 2:11 (see H. Anderson 1976: 330). However, Philo very clearly demonstrates that Hellenistic Jews were critical of the temple or rejected it—but accepted it at the same time (like Philo himself, as shall be demonstrated). If Stephen had similar ideas where temple rejection is concerned (despite substantial differences in relation to Philo), he might also have had similar ideas when it comes to actual support of the temple. We cannot, on the assumption that Stephen was a Hellenist (i.e. Greek speaking) Diaspora Jew, conclude that these Christians rejected the temple with all its functions.

The Epistle to the Hebrews is the writing that, more than any other New Testament writing, contains temple replacement formulations, also much in accordance with the Philonic language (cf. Williamson 1970). Its importance and place in a replacement theory is dependent on our evaluation of its date of composition, before or after the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. If there were no temple, replacement formulations are more understandable. The destruction of the Jerusalem temple is not directly mentioned and some passages presuppose that the temple buildings are still there (9:6ff), a fact that indicates a date of origin before 70 CE, although an earlier origin is also possible. The ending (13:18–25) is written in a Pauline style and if it is to be regarded as Pauline, the remarks about the temple must be made as if the temple was there. The declaration that the old covenant is obsolete and near to vanish (8:13) and the declaration of a new covenant (e.g. 9:15) are very well understandable if it was written at the time when there were no temple

buildings in Jerusalem.³⁰ In Heb 9:12, we are told that Jesus entered the real temple, that is the holy place in heaven, as an everlasting sacrifice and, again, the use of the word ἐφάπαξ underlines the importance of the death and resurrection of Jesus as a decisive event.

However, even Hebrews does not seem to reject the temple institution tout court. Heb 8:5 declares that there is a sanctuary, a tent in heaven, and that the other tent (the temple in Jerusalem) is a ὑπόδειγμα ('copy') and σκιά ('shadow') of the heavenly one. This Platonic way of thinking finds parallels in Philo (see chapter 5) and is a way of thinking that demands that the shadow exists for us to grasp the real object by the intellect.³¹ Some passages in Hebrews go far in superseding the temple (Heb 10:23–25; 13:13–15) in an *eschatological* hope, but it can be argued that the author also accepts it as a present institution.³²

When trying to infer a social practice from the statements in Hebrews, we shall have to include Heb 9:23ff. The present infinitive form of καθαρίζομαι in 9:23 indicates that this is the author's attitude towards the temple and sacrifices at that present time (cf. the present form εἰσέρχεται in 9:25 as well). This means that in spite of the clear-cut statements concerning the role of Christ as a better high priest with a better and once-and-for-all sacrifice and its eschatological scheme, in Hebrews there are also passages that make the far-reaching and general conclusions on a particular temple practice less probable. Heb 9:23ff do not witness that the author accepted the temple, but it is not rejected either even if it has no particular theological significance as Heb 9:10 may indicate on a general level. Nevertheless, Heb 10:3 also admits that the sacrifices in the temple do have one function as a reminder of sin (ἀνάμνησις αμαρτιῶν).

³⁰ See the presentation of discussion and its significance for the understanding of the temple relationship in Dunn (1991:87) and Theissen (1999:141). Theissen (1999:347, n. 5) wonders if the destruction should not be interpreted in 9:8–10 as an indication of the imminent end.

³¹ Dunn (1991:87) argues that since the temple is not mentioned, it is only the tabernacle (the very principle of a special cultus), a special priesthood, and continuing sacrifice that the author wished to contest, thus undercutting the theological rationale on which the temple might be reconstituted. Nevertheless, from my point of view it is important that the present tent and its sacrifices are alluded to as well.

³² Williamson (1970:157) argues that Heb 8:5 reflects the thoughts of a Christian theologian using categories of Christian eschatology and for that reason not truly Platonic, only semi-Platonic (1970:158–159), and the influence of Philo on the writer of Hebrews is for that reason minimal (1970:158) although there are undoubtedly some similarities (1970:182). There are also some similarities between Hebrews and later rabbinical writings (Bietenhard 1951:130).

The temple destroyed or not destroyed, the evidence is therefore not conclusive to claim that the writer of Hebrews no longer supported the Jerusalem temple institution in a sociologically significant way.³³

Summing up the New Testament evidence, I shall conclude that Schrenk's conclusion is still valid. In the New Testament, there is a twofold-attitude towards the temple and the sacrifices in Jerusalem. This is also the conclusion reached by scholars like Brown and Theissen. Brown (1966:121–122) argues that for the audience of the historical Jesus the actions of Jesus in 2:13–22 'would have been perfectly understandable in the light of the claim that he was a prophet and even the Messiah'.³⁴ The passage could indicate that there was even more fundamental opposition to the temple on Jesus' part, 'an opposition tending toward doing away with the Temple rather than reforming it' (Brown 1966:122).³⁵ This is, however, not probable, he maintains, 'since the early Christians saw no difficulty about offering sacrifice at the Temple' (1966:122). Brown (1994:452) also concludes that 'Some Christians may still have yearned for a new physical building that could meet God's standards' i.e. after the destruction in 70 CE. Theissen (1999:140–141) assumes that even Gentile Christians expected that the temple would one day be open to them and that they then could take part in Jewish sacrificial worship. On the other hand, John may have deepened the opposition to the temple in reporting the cleansing in the way it is done, and the Gospel of John would in that case belong to that branch of writings that are strongly anti-temple.

We can locate at least three different positions among the first Jewish-Christians concerning the attitudes towards the temple institution:

1. one that was strongly anti-temple,
2. a positive attitude of those that still attended the temple, and
3. one position that argued for a neglect of the temple or partly neglected it.³⁶

³³ The continuance with the past is also clearly indicated in passages like Heb 3–4; 8:8–12; 11:1–12:2.

³⁴ Referring to Jer 7:11; Mal 3:1; Isa 56:7, and the reference in Jn 2:16 to Zech 14:20–21. See also Hos 4:4–6; Mic 7:6–8 (see Yee 1989:61).

³⁵ In addition, both Josephus (in Bell. 6:288) and a rabbinical tradition (in b. Git. 56a, Lam. Rab. 1:5) bear witness to a similar apprehension about a destruction of the temple before the actual overthrow by the Romans in 70 CE, see Brown (1966:122).

³⁶ Cf. the support for this view in Schrenk (1965) and Dunn (1991:95).

Some passages bear witness to a detached attitude (e.g. Heb 8:5), some reflect a more critical standpoint (e.g. concerning Stephen in Acts 7:48), while others seem more positive and may indicate that Christians attended the temple services. In addition, the metaphorical use of temple expressions in Pauline letters is inconclusive in this matter, and should be taken as a spiritualising or substitute of the temple. Paul's attitude towards the temple seems to have been positive. Especially important is the evidence from the Gospel of Matthew and the indications of the practice of the Matthean community as well as the story about James and Paul in Acts 21:17–26.

The exegesis below (4.5–4.6; 6) is an attempt to analyse John's place in this NT picture, and I am asking if John presents the body of Jesus as an alternative temple—and in that case, how this was understood by the Johannine community.

4.4 THE TEMPLE REPLACEMENT THEORY AND JOHN

Variants of the temple replacement theory in different degrees are quite common among Johannine scholars, although the scholarly situation is not unanimous, and a more thorough investigation is necessary before the detailed text study.³⁷

The temple replacement theory may be seen as a part of a general supersession theory in the discussion between Judaism and Christianity today as well as in the past.³⁸ Not to realise this con-

³⁷ Sociological replacement theories concerning John are found particularly in Brown (1979:48ff); Neyrey (1988:130ff); Elliott (1998:288–289, 297). A replacement theory but without the sociological frame has been expressed by several scholars, a fact that some examples may demonstrate, see Dodd (1953:300ff); Cullmann (1958–1959:89; 1975); Schnackenburg (1971b:367); Lindars (1972:133); W. Davies (1974:288ff); Barrett (1978:201); Haenchen (1980); Hengel (1981); Kieffer (1987:70); Yee (1989); Carson (1988; 1991); Dunn (1991); Koester (1995:82–85); Casey (1996:134ff); Ådna (1993; 2000); Kerr (2002) and others.

³⁸ We may call it the 'replacement theory or motif', 'replacement theology', 'supersession' or 'substitution theology'. Recently, Bieringer, Pollefeyt, and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (2001b:25ff) have discussed the matter under the title 'Supersessionist Christology in John'. Svartvik (1998:91) points out the three main issues in the anti-Judaism of Christian replacement theology: 1. the Jews killed Jesus, the incarnate word of God, 2. Jesus' teaching was essentially different from contemporary Judaism and the reason for him being killed, 3. Judaism has no longer a right to exist since Jews have rejected Jesus as Messiah. See also Charlesworth (1991b). The attitude towards the Jerusalem temple among the Johannine Christians is a part of this

nection is devastating for the important present Jewish-Christian dialogue, and even if this is not the issue at stake here, the discussions surely reflect it somehow. Unrecognised ideological or theological overtones threaten the basis of the historical-critical approach itself.

Biblical scholars often refer to different matters when they talk about replacement where fulfilment is often confused with a replacement tout court.³⁹ When Barrett argues that 'The old church of Israel was rejected, or rejected itself, and a new church was brought into existence' (1978:92), he represents a quite radical position. Applied to Jn 2 and the temple cleansing, he claims about Jesus that his body 'is to be the true Temple, the house of prayer for all the nations' (1978:195). Barrett also argues that the implication of this claim recurs constantly in the Gospel, the church is the 'new People of God which includes Gentiles as well as 'Jews' referring to 10:16; 11:52. In connection with the temple worship issue in Jn 4, he claims that 'Jesus brings the fulfilment of all the Old Testament offered by way of worship' (1978:228).

Brown represents an even more radical understanding of the role of Jesus as a temple in the Gospel of John.⁴⁰ He follows an exegetical tradition seen already in Origen saying that the passage of 'temple

discussion. The relationship has usually been discussed as an opposition between 'Israel' and the 'church', as mentioned in chapter 1. It is a much-debated issue in Pauline studies, particularly in connection with Rom 9–11. See Borgen (1996b); Bekken (1998). Böttrich (1999) argues that the later ancient church may have seen the temple as substituted (referring to an unpublished dissertation from Heidelberg), but concludes this is not the case not in the first century: Paul's attitude towards the temple was positive.

³⁹ Bieringer, Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (2001b:26) conclude that there is a need to determine further the relationship between fulfilment and replacement and accept that the two concepts are not necessarily identical, although fulfilment 'often all too easily turns into replacement'.

⁴⁰ The following quote is essential for an understanding of his position (Brown 1978:11):

Derivatively from his high christology, John contends that the most sacred cultic institutions of Judaism have lost their significance for those who believe in Jesus. Jesus is now the place of divine tabernacling (1:14: *skénoun*); his body is the temple (2:21); and what Jesus says on the occasion of prominent Jewish feasts (Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, Dedication) systematically replaces the significance of those feasts. If the Jewish synagogues have expelled Christians, John's Christianity has negated and replaced Judaism. The believer in Jesus is a true Israelite (1:47); 'the Jews' are the children of the devil (8:44).

We find similar conclusions in his commentary on the Gospel of John (Brown 1966:LXX–LXXV, CXLIII–CXLIV; 1979:48–51; 1994:455, n. 38).

cleansing' in John together with the subsequent discussions in the Gospel refer to a 'replacement of Jewish institutions' (1966:121). Later, Brown (1979:49) stated that 'The Temple of Jerusalem may have been destroyed, but it has been replaced by the body of Jesus which is the true Temple (2:19–21)'. On the one side, earlier Christian witnesses (Matthew, Acts and Pauline letters) do demonstrate that the 'new covenant' meant a renewed covenant since 'there was not the sense of the new totally replacing the old' (1979:48). The Gospel of John, on the other side, demonstrates a completely new attitude, according to Brown (1979:48–49). Building on the rejection stated in 9:22 Kee, too, argues that there was a sharp break between the 'Old Covenant people and the new' in connection with the Gospel of John (Kee 1989:98). Dahl (1963:171–172) presents a similar view when saying that 'Alles kommt auf die Stellung zum Sohne an, an sich hat [sic!] die Erwählung und die heilige Geschichte, der Kultus und das Gesetz *keine Bedeutung*' (italics mine). In connection with the temple theme in Jn 4, Bultmann (1971:191) concludes that all other worship but the pneumatic one is untrue. Nevertheless, he represents a modified replacement theory as he argues that the statements concerning the proper temple place and worship in Jn 4 do not mean that all cultic worship was to be excluded, but that 'any cultic worship is only true worship if the eschatological event is realised in it' (Bultmann 1971:191, n. 3). Pancaro (1975) represents another and even less radical view concerning the Johannine attitude towards traditional Judaism when he declares that John 'thereby holds that Jesus' 'work' does mark the end of traditional Judaism (the Jews were not completely wrong!), but not the destruction of Judaism purely and simply' (1975:125).⁴¹

More astonishingly, the replacement theory in its more definite form is found in investigations using or evaluating the sociological approach. Neyrey (1988) sees replacements to take place in what he calls the second stage of the community's development.⁴² What was

⁴¹ In a semi-sociological way, he discusses the relationship of the Johannine community to traditional Judaism and argues that this relationship is evident on the basis of the distinction in the Gospel between 'Ισραηλίτης and 'Ιουδαίος. The 'church' (the Johannine community) is the 'New Israel', he claims (Pancaro 1974–1975:405).

⁴² Stage one is 'Missionary Propaganda' (Neyrey 1988:122), the second 'Replacement' (1988:130), and the third 'High Christology' (1988:142).

new in Neyrey's approach was not the diachronic analysis of the community, but his combination of the works of Martyn, Brown, Käsemann, and Meeks with the sociological 'group and grid' model from M. Douglas (Neyrey 1988:3) in relation to the Christology of John.⁴³ Neyrey follows a traditional replacement theory (Neyrey 1988:137):

1. Jesus claims to replace the physical temple with a new temple, which is his body (2:19–21). Jesus' challenge to the temple constitutes a formal attack on the extensive system of structuring Israel's life according to the patterns of order and classification symbolised in the temple.
2. Even as the temple is replaced by Jesus' body, so Jewish feasts are systematically replaced by Jesus with authentic feasts centred around his person and actions.

Neyrey concludes that the high Christology came to function as an *ideology of revolt* against and superiority over previously held values and structures, seen for instance in passages like 6:62; 8:23–24 (Neyrey 1988:208).⁴⁴

Barton (1993) points to what he regards as recommending results of the 'sectarian' understanding of the Gospel of John. One of its strong features, he says, is that it helps to make sense of the uncompromising exclusiveness of the Johannine Christology and soteriology, mentioning the relationship between the Son and the Father, the true worship that now takes place 'in spirit and truth' and not on

⁴³ See also my comments in chapter 1. 'Group' refers to the degree of societal pressure at work in a given social unit to conform to the society's definitions, classifications, and evaluations. Both 'group' and 'grid' may be high or low. 'Grid' refers to the degree of socially constrained adherence normally given by members of a society to the prevailing symbol system, its classifications, patterns of perception and evaluations, and so on, through which the society enables its members to bring order and intelligibility to their experience (Neyrey 1988:119). Neyrey argues that the Johannine group went through several stages of development, representing three quite different worldviews and social contexts. He concludes that 'the development of the Johannine community entails a progression from a strong group/low grid (stage one) to strong group/rising grid (stage two) and finally to weak group/low grid (stage three)' (1988:148–149).

⁴⁴ Elliott (1998) finds a general replacement to have taken place when the Jesus movement changed from being a faction to a 'sect'. He refers to the theories on John by Brown and Neyrey referring among other passages to Jn 2:18–22 (Elliott 1998:288–289).

Mount Gerizim or Mount Zion (4:19ff).⁴⁵ The opinions on this matter show that a replacement thesis among Johannine scholars is common and that it often assumes a rejection of the geographical temple and its cultus that had taken place before or after the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem on theological or christological grounds.⁴⁶ The thesis has been challenged based on an alternative model of reconciliation, and on a general ground in later biblical scholarship concerning the question of the relationship between Jews and Christians.⁴⁷ From this basic assumption, the question arises regarding how they actually departed at the end. Dunn (1991) is an example of a scholar who has questioned the rude replacement theology also in John and is able to argue both theologically, historically and sociologically. In addition to what is said above on his position, it is important to notice that it includes the conviction that Judaism and Christianity share the same historical matrix and often defined themselves in light of and against one another (Dunn 1991:17). Dunn's argument is on the one hand that the temple is made redundant, there was no need for it (1991:92). We may nevertheless dis-

⁴⁵ Barton (1993:146) concludes that: 'In fact, almost every major symbol of belonging as a Jew to the people of God—temple, Torah, festival calendar, sabbath observance, the land, the scriptures and the patriarchs—is displaced in a quite counter-cultural way by the Jesus of John.'

⁴⁶ W. Davies (1974:288ff) finds that John presents a departure from the temple institution at several places, not only in the story of the temple cleansing. He reads for instance 7:14 in combination with 8:59 in a symbolical way: Jesus enters the temple (7:14) and then leaves it (8:59). He finds a whole series of replacements associated with the feasts of Judaism in John, culminating with the christological claims of 10:35–37 concerning Jesus' status as son of God υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. There are, however, no signs in the text or context of 8:59 that it should be read symbolically and the reading of W. Davies is an overinterpretation. Kysar (1992b:917) contends that the temple cleansing is 'thought to be a representation of the manner in which the revelation of God in Christ cleanses and replaces contemporary Judaism'. Casey (1996:134–136) presents a rather simple, but common replacement theory in relation to symbolic aspects of the Johannine community. This theory includes replacement of the 'whole sacrificial system', including the temple, the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles and is seen in symbols like the shepherd and the vine.

⁴⁷ See, for instance, the discussion of this relationship in Pancaro (1975:494); E. P. Sanders (1985; 1992); Segal (1986; 1990); Dunn (1991); Overman (1990); Chilton (1994); Chilton and Neusner (1995). These scholars argue in favour of a picture presenting close relations, and Segal even speaks of 'fraternal twins' (Segal 1986:179). Lieu argues that spatial markers, such as 'temple' and 'synagogue' do not 'trace the separation of John's community from the synagogue, as often supposed' (1999:51). Kinzer, too, argues that 'John does not call into question the fundamental legitimacy of the Jerusalem Temple and its priesthood' (1998:462) and seeks to trace the background of John's Christology in first-century Jewish Temple mysticism.

cern two different temple tendencies among the first Christians, but it was only the voice of those who regarded the temple as no longer relevant which has been preserved in the canonical texts, Dunn argues (1991:95–96). On the other hand, Dunn also convincingly contends that the significance of the temple destruction was decisive for the *beginning* of the parting of the ways, not the end, and that ‘talk of a clear-cut or final parting of the ways in 70 CE is distinctly premature’ (1991:238).⁴⁸ The major parting was not undertaken before after the second Jewish revolt in 132–135 CE, he argues (1991:238).⁴⁹ A similar position that is exploited within a sociological or social anthropological perspective is presented by Theissen (1999). He discusses the replacement of sacrifice and presumes that the earliest Christians ceased to sacrifice only after the destruction of the temple (1999:139ff). What he calls the ‘replacement of sacrifice’ is a process that started after 70 CE. Theissen studies the ‘sign language’ of the Christians and how this language offered functional equivalents for the ritual sacrifice. This is a refined replacement theory of sacrifice that I find promising and in accordance with my own way of investigation. Similar to my conclusions is also Frühwald-König (1998) who argues that the Johannine Jesus did not want to reject the temple and in fact detached himself more to the synagogue than to the temple and temple-related festivals (1998:223).

What I intend to do here is to address this question in a similar way to Dunn, by a systematic analysis of how the temple and temple related issues in John reflect the practices in the Johannine community and its general social attitude as far as the sources allow us to conclude in a general way.⁵⁰ In this quest for the Johannine characteristics,

⁴⁸ Schrenk (1965:245) also thought that this superiority started an emancipation process, which bloomed after the destruction of the temple. From my point of view, it is difficult to say that the Johannine community at the time of the writing down of the Gospel had reached a stage where this emancipation had been fulfilled.

⁴⁹ See also O’Day (1996:202) who argues that Jn 12:23–36 suggests an alternative model of reconciliation with its emphasis on restoration of relationship that came with the death and the belief in the resurrection of Jesus. A similar reconciliation is described in metaphors of new birth and new life (e.g. Jn 1:12–13; 3:3, 7; 6:51; 12:50). It is the incarnation that is the starting point of a conversation on reconciliation, O’Day argues (1996:203). The model surely reduces the picture of a severe tension between the Johannine community and the temple Judaism concerning the correct sacrifice.

⁵⁰ Studies such as Pancaro (1969–1970; 1974–1975; 1975) come close to mine thematically, although I, when it comes to my sociological perspective, also differ

I have found Philo and Qumran to be of help in an unexpected way. Before going into the analysis of the texts, let me clarify some basic notions of what I look upon as the 'logic of replacement'. One might take 'replacing' as an equivalent to 'neglecting' or 'rejecting' and even include 'destroying'. However, I will take 'replace' to refer to what happens when something (or somebody) takes the place of something (somebody) else, not just in the meaning 'to put something back in its place' or 'reorder'. Also, in order to grasp replacement, we must differentiate between these factors and locate them in the text:

1. What is replaced (object in the sentence 'A replaces B'), and
2. a replacer or what is replacing (subject in the sentence 'A replaces B'),
3. the two items also require a more or less explicit replacing statement saying that 'A has now taken the place of B' in one or another way, and
4. the replacing process must have an agent (or several) that causes or accomplishes the process.

In an actual historical situation, a certain ambivalence is to be expected in matters of replacement; people normally held opposing views and ways of acting simultaneously. From a rationalist and doctrinal point of view, this is uncomfortable, but from a sociological point of view, logic is not always to be expected. Theoretically, the replacing item might be introduced because the replaced item is lost, rejected, or reinterpreted in light of new experiences. It may be lost by way of historical processes, for instance as a destruction of some kind again leading to new solutions, or could be rejected because of defilement in presence or past. Naturally, too, and as stated above,

from Pancaro by focusing on the attitude towards the temple and its possible social consequences. A recent strong support for the replacement theory in Johannine scholarship is Kerr (2002).

Chilton (1992) wants to characterise the religious language of sacrifice of Jesus. He refers to the theory of supersession of the temple sacrifices, and says that he soon understood that he had to extend his study from 'Protestant Enlightenment, in which sacrifice appears, not only superseded by Jesus, but as requiring supersession'. Chilton develops his own typology of sacrifice, partly based on the theories of R. Girard. His focus is therefore somewhat different from the one I have chosen, but he has several interesting observations. Chilton primarily discusses the historical Jesus, and dismisses all references that allege Jesus' rejection or transcendence of Judaism as 'an instance of apologetics' (1992:120).

a replacement may not be complete; from a sociological point of view, we may talk about *degrees* of replacement and related to different functions of the original institution. In narratives of the kind we find in the gospels, one may not expect to find any such complete replacement expressed, but the more we find of such statements, the better.

The protest against defilement is the typical ‘sectarian’ attitude according to the sociological ‘sect-cult’ model from R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985). The Christian critical attitudes towards the temple can also be seen as a call for reform, a fact that demonstrates the importance of the ‘sect model’ (Dunn 1991:95). As I pointed out in relation to Elliott’s view of the ‘cult’ model in chapter 1, Elliott (1998:302–303) argues that the early church cannot be seen as an innovating ‘cult’ since the early Christians only wanted to reform Judaism. However, as also stated above, since ‘reform’ or ‘renewal’ is ambiguous, the ‘cult’ model actually urges us to ask whether the demand to reform is an innovating reform or a refurbishing one.

The replaced items may include all the references mentioned above concerning temple related issues in John, i.e. references both to the buildings, to cultic functions such as its sacrificial or atoning rites, its status as a place in which God’s presence is revealed and as a place of worship of God. The replacing item may be of physical character or some kind of a transferred character. The replacing statements towards any of the temple functions must be considered relative to the functions referred to in the texts (both replacer and replaced item), and it is fair to demand that conclusions pointing towards a complete replacement must be able to draw in several, if not all, of these functions. Some statements seem to refer to a neglect of the temple worship without any further specification, an observation that renders the meaning and degree of replacement uncertain.

4.5 THE TEMPLES IN JN 2:13–22

4.5.1 *Temple Cleansing or Temple Rejection?*

As a parallel story of the Synoptics and the Gospel of John, the ‘temple cleansing’ passage is a most illustrative one for the study of the Johannine community.⁵¹ When compared to the Synoptics and Acts three pericopes may be traced in John:

⁵¹ Compare the similar stories in John and the Synoptics about John the Baptist

1. The cleansing proper (Jn 2:13–17) is found in Mt 21:12–13; Mk 11:15–17; Lk 19:45–46,
2. the challenge (Jn 2:18 or 2:18–20) is found in Mt 21:23–27; Mk 11:27–33; Lk 20:1–8, and
3. the prophecy of the destruction of the temple (Jn 2:19) is found in Mt 26:61; Mk 14:(57–)58; 15:29; Acts 6:14.

There are important variants of the story between the Synoptics and John that are hard to explain historically. We find differences both in composition of the story, in wording, in interpretation of Jesus' action at the temple, in discussion afterwards and above all in location of the passage, its narrative chronology. The synoptic accounts have on the other side, only minor internal differences, (e.g. Mk 11:16). A possible explanation for the divergence in the story of the temple cleansing is that we are dealing with two different cleansing stories, one at the start of Jesus' mission (reported by John), and one at the end (reported by the Synoptics). This solution is possible, but too conjectural even if we take the Johannine account to be a result of a parallel running tradition, independent of the Synoptics.⁵² The theory of an independent Johannine tradition reduces the necessity of a detailed analysis in a literary- and traditional-critical perspective in connection with the Johannine passages that are synoptic parallels regarding the community and its social characteristics. Another problem with the study of literary and spoken transmission of the

and the baptism of Jesus (1:19, 29), the calling of disciples (1:35ff), the references to a Roman official (4:46ff), the feeding of the five thousand (6:1ff), the walking on the water (6:16ff) and above all the passion narrative (18–19).

⁵² A comparison with the Synoptics leads to the question of the relationship between these gospels and the Gospel of John in general. Some scholars held the opinion that Mark was the source for John, see Barrett (1978:195); Lindars (1972:134); Neirynck (1990:438ff). Barrett (1978:196) argues that John collects 'scattered synoptic material and synoptic themes, welds them into a whole, and uses them to bring out unmistakably the true meaning of the synoptic presentation of Jesus, etc.'. Bultmann (1971:122) claims that John had his own literary source. Others, like Dodd (1963:161), Borgen (1990:408ff), and Brown (1966:120–122), argue that the evangelist had access to an independent and parallel tradition. Ådna (2000:189) also supports the theory of one single historical event, but two independent traditions. In addition, he aims at distinguishing and comparing pre-Markian and pre-Johannine traditions, cf. Ådna (1993:541–553).

My exegesis does not necessarily presuppose any of these theories concerning the origin of the Gospel of John in general. The Synoptics are employed here to contrast the Johannine characteristics of this very case.

Johannine text before the final version is the complexity of the matter.⁵³

What the stories of the four gospels actually refer to in the life of Jesus and the meaning of the incident for Jesus are much disputed themes in the scholarly debate. The results of this debate are partly informative for the study of the passage on the Johannine level.⁵⁴ It calls for explanations for instance, when John lets Jesus himself utter the prophecy of destruction, while Matthew and Mark put the words into false witnesses (Mk 14:58 and Mt 26:60–61). The problem of naming the incident is partly due to our lack of knowledge of the historical situation around the temple and partly due to the ambiguities rising from the differences between the four gospel stories. The historical knowledge has been much improved the last thirty years, and new archaeological evidence supports the theory that Jesus in a small scale may have hindered the sacrifice (Ådna 1999:463). In that case, the incident was deliberately symbolic and is presented as such by the evangelists. Therefore, some scholars prefer not to call it a cleansing at all, arguing in different ways that Jesus was providing a prophetic portent of the temple's destruction.⁵⁵ Others defend a kind of purificatory meaning of the symbolic acts of the story.⁵⁶ Lindars (1972:137) argues that it was unlikely that Jesus was

⁵³ See the discussion in Roloff (1970:108). To distinguish between tradition and redaction is nevertheless possible on one level (see my chapter 3). The Johannine comments are clearly editorial and for that reason they may also be telling in the quest for the attitudes of the community or the 'historical John', but it is of course difficult to know how much the traditional material outside the editorial comments have been transformed.

⁵⁴ On the scholarly discussion in relation to the intentions of the historical Jesus, see Ådna (2000:5–22).

⁵⁵ Some scholars prefer to let the stories refer to an incident they call the 'so-called temple 'cleansing'' or they find new terms. Ådna (1993) stresses the word 'so-called' in the expression 'die sogenannte Tempelreinigung' throughout his thesis. His unwillingness to use the term 'cleansing' is also evident from his later reworking of the dissertation. Ådna (1999) calls the incident 'Jesus' symbolic act in the temple' (in connection with Mk 11:15–17). Ådna (2000) uses both 'die Tempelaktion' and 'das Tempelwort' (cf. the titles). Brown (1994:455, n. 39), Dunn (1991:57), E. P. Sanders (1985:61–76), Neusner (1989) also oppose labelling the incident as a cleansing.

⁵⁶ Bauckham argues that Jesus' demonstration was not a disapproval of the sacrifices per se, but 'an attack on the whole of the financial arrangements for the sacrificial system' and 'a challenge to the political-economic *status quo*' (1988:88). See also Theissen (1976); Evans (1989); Chilton (1992:136; 1994:60); Carson (1991:179); H. Betz (1997); Busse (1997).

attacking abuses because the control was good. Nor was he trying to open the temple to Gentiles, because they had already had the right to worship in the court of Gentiles. Lindars concludes that 'The only other alternative is that he was attacking the whole idea of the Temple and its sacrificial system (as the Johannine account suggests) in the manner of Jeremiah of old (cf. Jer. 7.1–14, from which 'a den of robbers' is quoted).' Ådna (2000:334–430) sums up the scholarly situation by depicting three main categories and several sub-categories concerning the understanding of the incident (on the first level). He differentiates between non-eschatological understanding, eschatological understanding, and messianic-eschatological understanding of the cleansing and the prophecy of destruction. Ådna himself sees the temple action and prophecy as part of Jesus' own Messianism, as a last cry to conversion.

My point of departure is rather the ambiguous general picture of the temple relationship that we gain from the totality of New Testament evidence. Despite the meaning of the incident for the historical Jesus or the presentation of this meaning in the gospels, the positive attitudes towards the temple by some of the first Christians clearly indicate that the temple institution was *not* easily abandoned even if it was theoretically or theologically surpassed.

Moreover, as the historical Jesus is not in the centre of my investigation, I am focusing on the processes possibly involved in the end production of the Fourth Gospel at the time when the temple was destroyed, and on the social characteristics of the Johannine community in the forming the Gospel. The exact historical (diachronic) development of the alleged community remains uncertain. My focus is on the period at the time when the Gospel was written down, possibly at around 90–100 CE and its near past.⁵⁷ Arguments used in the scholarly debate concerning the character of these stories as well as the evaluation of the temple relationship on the second level

⁵⁷ Concerning a possible historical development of the history of the community, see particularly Brown (1979:22–24) but also Martyn (1979), Wengst (1981), Borgen (1991) and Frühwald-König (1998) among others. For a discussion of the dating of the Gospel of John, see the consensus view explained by Barrett (1978:127ff), now challenged by K. Berger (1997). While concentrating on internal evidence, K. Berger does not face the challenge of an early dating from the fact that the orthodox Christian writers seem unaware of the existence of the Gospel. The first evidence of the use of the Gospel is from gnostic sources (Barrett 1978:124–125).

may in the next round have impacts on the evaluation of the historical Jesus, but that is yet another discussion.

4.5.2 *Formal Analysis*

This analysis contains three formal aspects of the passage 2:13–22, i.e. location in the gospel narrative, fusion of pericopes (traditions or sources) and composition (structure).

4.5.2.1 *Location*

Where location in the gospel narrative or narrative chronology is concerned, the order of presented events within the entire Gospel has caused many theories about the possible intentions of John. In 2:13, we are immediately lead into the ‘Passover of the Jews’ (τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων) and Jesus ‘walked up to Jerusalem’ (ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα), as one of the first reported incidents during his ministry. In the Synoptics, this incident is said to have taken place at the one and only Passover where Jesus came to Jerusalem and at which he was crucified.⁵⁸

The whole of John’s composition might be theologically motivated, a theory that emphasises the prominent place of the passage as a key to interpretation of the Gospel. The links of the stories both before and after the temple cleansing are significant since they are missing in the Synoptics. As pointed out above, the section 1:19–12:50 forms one unit, a ‘book of signs’ where Jesus ‘reveals himself to the world and to his own’ (Brown 1988:16). Similarly, the signs in 1:19–4:54 may represent a unit with discussions of features in the traditional practice: the story of the wedding of Cana indicates discussions of Jewish purification rules, the cleansing takes up the relation to the Jerusalem temple, the Nicodemus dialogue discusses the necessity of a new start or birth from above even for the ‘Jews’, and the Samaritan story discusses the geographical boundaries of the worship. The literary problem is that of the disposition of the material,

⁵⁸ See Mt 21:12–13; Mk 11:15ff; Lk 19:45ff. Barrett (1978:195), as do many commentators, argues that the cleansing historically took place late in the ministry of Jesus, as the synoptic tradition also testifies. Brown (1966:118) agrees, but he thinks that the prophecy about the destruction can be dated early, partly because the witnesses, according to the synoptic traditions, had problems remembering the exact words of Jesus.

and Lindars (1972:134) argues that the temple cleansing originally belonged to the section of the last Passover also in John.⁵⁹ Such considerations, however, have little impact on the understanding of this passage in relation to the Passover and possible replacement motifs in that connection. If, for instance, the passage originally belonged to Jn 12, as Lindars argues, the context of the cleansing was still the Passover festival and could still be connected to the attitudes of the community towards temple Judaism.

The presented chronology may indicate that the author wanted to stress the importance of this story, but the meaning of this accentuation is in any case relative to our overall interpretation of the passage. Schnelle (1996:359–360), for instance, argues that the passage stresses features in accordance with *Schnelle's* overall understanding of the passage, such as the theology of the cross (Christology) and Jesus as the true place of salvation (ecclesiology). The importance of the chronology is a feature of form that yields next to nothing if not filled with argumentative force from other observations. The interesting question from my perspective is how Jesus is presented within the traditional Jewish temple framework of the Gospel of John, as will be shown.

4.5.2.2 *Fusion of Pericopes*

Where a possible fusion or combination of traditions or sources is concerned, we may take as our point of departure the three sections in the Johannine version that find parallel material at different places in the Synoptic Gospels and in Acts. These sections may be used as guidelines to a re-construction of the passage:

1. The temple cleansing. In Jn 2:13–17 (the temple cleansing proper and the reactions of the disciples), we find synoptic material in Mt 21:10–17, and Luke writes in 19:45–46 that Jesus cleansed the temple on the same day that he arrived in Jerusalem. In Mk 11:15–19, he came to the temple the day after his first arrival to the town (Mk 11:11).

⁵⁹ Supported by Ashton (1991:414, n. 18). Lindars (1972:50–51) argues that the reason for John to place the passage at the beginning of the Gospel may be that it was not particularly suitable at the end of the Gospel in connection with the resurrection of Lazarus, which is presented as the prime motive for the priest's plot (11:46).

2. The challenge from the 'Jews'. The challenge in Jn 2:18 (Jesus challenged immediately after the cleansing) is found in Mk 11:27–28 et par. where Jesus was challenged the day after the cleansing.
3. The prophecy. To Jn 2:19–20 (the prophecy of the temple destruction) we find parallels in Mk 14:58; Mt 26:61 which tell us that someone lied against Jesus at the trial, saying that Jesus had wanted to tear down the temple and build it back up three days later. The destruction of the temple is also mentioned when Jesus is hanging on the cross, see Mk 15:29; Mt 27:40. Luke mentions these accusations in the trial of Stephen in Acts 6:14.

Further literary details are not necessary for my purpose (see for instance the analysis in Borgen 1990:149–155; Ådna 2000:179–190). This division is based upon the sequel in the Synoptics, but in John, the challenge from the 'Jews' is much more clearly connected to the cleansing event itself.⁶⁰ As in John, this means that the challenge in Mark may be looked upon as a part of the cleansing story.⁶¹ The comparison with the Synoptics at this point shows that we have two different components in the Johannine passage:

1. The cleansing proper (with the actual cleansing and the challenge) and
2. the prophecy about the temple destruction.

⁶⁰ Even in Mark the challenge seems to refer to the cleansing; it is at least difficult to see what ταῦτα in Mk 11:28 is supposed to refer to, if not to the temple cleansing in Mk 11:15ff. The wording in the challenge is very similar in John and Mark, compare Mk 11:28 and Jn 2:18. Cf. Mk 11:28 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· ἐν ποίᾳ ἐξουσίᾳ ταῦτα ποιεῖς; ἢ τίς σοι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἵνα ταῦτα ποιῇς; Jn 2:18 ἀπεκρίθησαν οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, Τί σημεῖον δεικνύεις ἡμῖν ὅτι ταῦτα ποιεῖς; In Matthew and Luke, the challenge clearly points back to the teaching of Jesus (see Mt 21:23 and Lk 20:2).

⁶¹ Bultmann (1971:125, n.1) argued that since the challenge in Mk 11:27 is not a literary (i.e. exact word for word) parallel to Jn 2:18, there is no need to suppose that the 'narrator' (John) had connected the cleansing and the challenge from the synoptic literature, e.g. Mk 11:15–17, 27–28. Dodd (1963:160–161) argues that John has followed an independent strain of tradition here partly since he presents a sequel that seems more natural than the synoptic one. Neirynck (1979) argues against Boismard and Lamouille (1977) that the similarity between John and the Synoptics at this point cannot be denied, a position supported by Borgen (1990:434). For me, the differences are interesting, independent of the question of their genesis.

In addition to these two components, the comparison between the Synoptics and the Gospel of John allows us to see even more clearly that the Johannine passage consists of yet another component, the Johannine comments and transitional remarks (2:13, 17, 21, 22). As the comments and remarks are keys to the understanding of the passage, they are essential for an evaluation of the end result. The comments point beyond the first level towards the activity of a post-Easter community.

The analysis of the pericopes in 2:13–22 has demonstrated that the passage displays three characteristics. First, regardless of what historically took place (both on the first and on the second level), the Gospel of John presents the prophecy to be a saying of Jesus himself, a direct answer to the challenge from the ‘Jews’. Secondly, it gives suggestive comments to the reading of the prophecy, demonstrating the preferred reading. Thirdly, by combining cleansing and prophecy in this way, the text presents an enigma that is only solved by the comment in 2:21–22, adding further stress on the importance of these verses.

4.5.2.3 *Structure*

The structure of the passage may be divided in several ways. Based on redactional criteria we may divide the passage into three sections: 1. 2:13 (introduction), 2. 2:14–22: Jesus in the temple with two sub-sections (2:14–17 and 2:18–21), and 3. 2:22: post-resurrectional comment of faith.⁶² Borgen (1990) has suggested a fruitful alternative, I think, with an arrangement of the passage that also demonstrates a partly opposing structure of the passage in relation to the one mentioned above based on the synoptic pericopes:

1. Introductory comment (2:13),
2. action (2:14–16), and
3. debate (2:17–22) with three different comments reflecting the Johannine position and with the challenge included to introduce further comments,
 - a. comment on the reason for Jesus being consumed (i.e. the transitional remark of 2:17),

⁶² Cf. Ådna 1993:547–548), while Ulrichsen (2003:203) follows Schnackenburg (1970a:360): 1. frame (2:13), 2. cleansing (2:14–17), and 3. questioning (2:18–22).

- b. comment on the temple saying of Jesus (2:21), and
- c. a comment on post-Easter reflections by the disciples (2:22).

Borgen (1990:432ff) argues that this arrangement is in accordance with the classical exposition structure ‘case-debate’ where 2:13–16 forms the first part, the ‘case’ or event or the unit of tradition, and 2:17–22 the second part, the ‘debate’ with the expository comments. In this way, the structure obliterates the structure inferred from the Synoptics with the components, cleansing (13–17), challenge (18–20), and comment (21–22).⁶³

According to Borgen there are four observations showing that the debate in 2:17–22 may be regarded as an exposition of the case presented in 2:13–16 (Borgen 1990:436):

1. Temple and house, ἱερόν and οἶκος (2:14, 15, 16) from the first part are interpreted in the second part, in 2:17 οἶκος is taken up from 2:16 and from 2:18–21 with the synonym ναός that may be an elaboration of ἱερόν.
2. Jn 2:22 concludes the passage by connecting it to the Old Testament citation from the Psalms in 2:17. This quotation indicates the meaning of the cleansing in a particular way,
3. Jn 2:17 introduces the interpretation, and
4. ταῦτα in 2:18 refers back to the cleansing.

Ulrichsen (2003:204) argues against this structure for three reasons: 2:16 and 2:17 can hardly be placed in two different sections since they are logically connected, the two main sections (2:14–17 and 2:18–22) are concluded with comments of the disciples’ reflections, and finally, the particle οὖν in 2:18 also clearly demonstrates that

⁶³ Borgen also observes the same structure in Jn 5 and 6. The general aim of Borgen’s paper is not a discussion of the temple cleansing in isolation, but to discuss the hypothesis that John and the Synoptics are mutually independent, which Borgen argues they are, supporting theories of Dodd (1963) among others, while criticising Neirynck (1990) among others. Borgen starts with an investigation of pre-synoptic material in Paul’s 1 Cor 10:3–4, 16, 17, 21; 11:23–29, comparing it with the synoptic version of Mk 14:22–25. He finds that the agreements between the Johannine material and the synoptic material are neither close, nor more striking, than those between the passages studied from Paul and Mark. He also wants to let this comparison throw light upon the transmission of tradition and expository and paraphrasal usage of the tradition in John.

the verse starts a new section. The passage would then be a composition of combined traditions of cleansing and temple-prophecy (perhaps independent of the Synoptics).

Nevertheless, there are *traces* of the ‘case-debate’ form as Borgen argues. Borgen’s approach is easily connected to the two-level analysis employed in my investigation in a joint method demonstrating more of the implicit intentions of the author. In that case, the debate-part, 2:17–22, is composed of two kinds of direct reference to the temple: discussion and comments. 2:17 concludes the action of the cleansing, and 2:21–22 concludes the whole passage. 2:21 and 2:22 are comments and clues to the way the Johannine community looked upon the Jerusalem temple. The meaning of the passage on the second level of interpretation may therefore be extracted from the authoritative component of 2:17–22 alone. Particular weight has to be put on the comment in 2:21 which points back to the saying of Jesus in 2:19 and perhaps also to 2:17.⁶⁴

4.5.2.4 *Formal Analysis and the Community*

All three elements of the formal investigation, the narrative chronology, the combination of pericopes and the structure of the passage, have relevance for this study of the Johannine community. The unexpected *location* of the ‘temple cleansing’ reinforces the topical connection with the first part of the Gospel, the ‘book of signs’ (at least 1:19–4:54) and thus makes the logical connection between Jn 2 and Jn 4 more plausible, a conclusion supporting the synopsis of these passages (see below). The *combination* of traditions known from other writings in the New Testament points to the individuality of the Gospel of John concerning the temple cleansing since the prophecy is put into the mouth of Jesus and leads to the author’s declaration of Jesus’ body as a temple. The *compositional* analysis explores the consequences of the case-debate form, which gives special attention to the debate-passages in which the interpretation and message of the author are given. The case-debate form would indicate that details in the case-story are of minor interest for the understanding of the

⁶⁴ Borgen’s general theses are also criticised by Neirynck (1990). Neirynck opposes Borgen’s claim about the independence of John, but is in agreement concerning the existence of a ‘form’ consisting of an expository interpretation and a paraphrasing commentary in 2:12–22 (Neirynck 1990:450), cf. Boismard and Lamouille (1977).

whole passage on the second level. Furthermore, the details are often accentuated by comments in a symbolic manner (see also below), e.g. the signification of Jesus driving out the sacrificial animals, the description of Jesus making a whip instead of using a stick, and of the importance of the fact that neither the doves nor the dove sellers were driven out. Distinctive emphasis should therefore *not* be put on the quotation in 2:17 in the overall understanding of the passage, but rather on the definition of the body of Jesus as a temple in 2:21.

2:13–22 mentions the temple five times, representing five relations between Jesus and the temple, once in the introduction, once in the event-part, twice in the debate part and once in the postscript. In the introduction (2:13), it is indicated that Jesus participated in the Jewish temple cultus, an observation that is repeated at the end of the story (2:23). In the rest of the event-part, 2:14–16, Jesus is presented as a temple reformer. At least this is the initial impression as Jesus seems to be attacking what he regards as abusive practice. In the first part of the debate-part, 2:18–20, Jesus is presented as a temple rebuilders; if we read this passage isolated this is at least the initial impression. In the last section of the debate-part, 2:21–22, the interpretative key is given for the enigmatic temple prophecy, the body of Jesus is now identified by the author as a temple. They all present how the community looked upon the relation of Jesus to the temple.

4.5.3 *Near Context and Transitional Remarks*

In Jn 2:13, the scenery description takes us from Capernaum to Jerusalem, a fact that marks the beginning of a new story. At the same time, the transition also connects the present passage thematically to the preceding story of the wedding at Cana (2:1–12). In the explanation of the purpose of the water jars in 2:6, the jars are described as part of a typical Jewish custom, the cleansing (before eating), κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμόν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. This explanation (with a genitive plural of Ἰουδαίος) is similar to the form seen in 2:13 concerning the Passover, τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων—thus indicating a thematic coherence of these passages.⁶⁵

⁶⁵ In addition, several topical arguments are used by scholars demonstrating the coherence of Jn 2 (see Dodd 1953:297).

Consequently, Brown (1966:121) argues that the cleansing in the subsequent passage fits in with motifs already seen at the wedding at Cana in 2:1–12, a story that in his view, also contains replacing motifs. He sees a ‘replacement of Jewish institutions, and an abundance of wine heralding the messianic times’. Brown puts forward the argument that the replacement of water with wine is a sign telling who Jesus is. ‘All previous religious institutions, customs and feasts lose meaning in his presence’, he argues (Brown 1966:104). He rightly draws in the meaning of the preceding context to enlighten the ‘temple cleansing’, but does the story of the wedding at Cana in fact say that old traditions or customs were terminated by Jesus and that this is what was preached to and by the Johannine community?

If there are any replacement motifs in 2:1–12, the use of the jars and the making of good wine are two possible candidates. However, there are several problems of logic in the metaphorical language involved in regarding the text as demonstrating that John is presenting a replacement of a Jewish institution of some kind if we read the narrative in the way of Brown. If abundance of wine is a central point in the story, it tells us more about the new conditions of life than rejecting the previous ones. The chief steward’s conclusion that the second type of wine was better than the first type (2:10), points rather to an improvement than total abrogation. In fact, the conclusion by John of the story in 2:11 does not stress the abundance of wine, only the changing of water to wine. Οὗτος in the expression ταύτην ἐποίησεν . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς does not specify anything particular in the preceding story.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ Lindars (1972:133) too, argues that the marriage at Cana and the temple cleansing both demonstrate that ‘he brings a new and better way of access to God’. However, he also argues that the symbolic act of Jesus in the temple cleansing story ‘indicates a radical break with the existing religion of Judaism’. He argues that the narrative development in the Gospel of John by the report on Nicodemus, representative of official Judaism, and the subsequent stories of the Samaritans and the Gentile reflect at the same time the spread of the church described in Acts 1–11. The discourse with Nicodemus expresses even more strongly the radical break with the past, Lindars argues. The relevance of this statement for the relationship between Jesus and the temple involved in 2:13–22 is, however, minimal. Lindars seems to have confused the personal challenge found in Jn 3 and the challenge towards the temple Judaism in Jn 2. The Nicodemus story can only be used to point to a new reality ascribed to the followers of Jesus as being born from above or born again (3:3).

As argued above by way of formal analysis, the scenery shift in 2:13 announces a new story, but at the same time, it connects the present passage thematically to the preceding story. The pilgrimage to Jerusalem seems to refer to the customary pilgrimage to Jerusalem,⁶⁷ and Jesus is thus presented as participating in this main *Jewish* pilgrim festival. This observation is my starting point for the subsequent interpretation.

The episode with the cleansing takes place not only in the Jewish cultic centre, Jerusalem, but it is also connected to a special temple occasion, the temple cultus at Passover that was about to be celebrated, see 2:13 (ἐγγὺς ἦν τὸ πάσχα).⁶⁸ In 2:14, the scenery is further centred around the temple, (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ)—as Jesus is reported to pay a visit to the sanctuary. Thus, from the very beginning of this passage Jesus is described both as a ‘Jew’ and undoubtedly as a temple adherent. 2:23 reports that the time of Passover had come, further reinforcing the Passover theme and making it a frame within which this passage is to be seen. The comments of 2:23–24 could be reckoned together with the temple cleansing of 2:13–22 as it continues the comment in 2:21–22 and as 2:23 repeats the name of the coming festival. However, these comments also function as a transitional remark from the story of the temple cleansing to the Nicodemus story in Jn 3. With the festival theme as compositional a framework of 2:14–22, the community are locates Jesus on a scene governed by the temple-theme. It is thus possible to limit a detailed exegesis of the temple cleansing to 2:13–22. The word Ἰουδαῖος (‘Jew’ or ‘Judean’) is used three times in Jn 2, in 2:2, 2:13, and 2:23. The use of the word Ἰουδαῖοι in Jn 2 is connected to two typical traits of the Jewish socio-cultural milieu: rites of purification (2:6) and the Jerusalem pilgrimage (2:13, 23). Is it possible to see Jesus as a part of this socio-cultural milieu, or is he depicted as in opposition to it? The problem is that the author seems to separate Jesus from the adherence of the Jewish customs alone by using the word while still a part of Judaism. So, what does he mean by telling us that Jesus was operating among Ἰουδαῖοι?

⁶⁷ For instance Josephus Bell. 2:10 demonstrates its dominant position and traditional character, referring to the vast crowd that streamed in from the country for the ceremony.

⁶⁸ As the expression recalls a well-known Hebrew construction (Barrett 1978:197), cf. Jn 6:4; 7:2; 11:55, it further underlines the Jewish context.

The reference of the word on the first level seems to be those who participate in these customs and celebrate, thus including Galileans (see 4:45). The expression τὸ πάσχα τῶν Ἰουδαίων (2:13) indicates that John has given the word Ἰουδαῖος a different meaning. Perhaps he is alluding to a Christian Passover that had already been institutionalised; it is as if John was emphasising the word 'Jewish' against the Passover celebration known by him as 'Christian'. In that case, it weakens the argument that Jesus, for the Johannine community, is depicted as a temple adherent. However, as Lindars (1972:137) argues, there are no Christian counterparts to the Jewish Tabernacles in 7:2—a passage that has the same phrasing. The word Ἰουδαῖος is used in different ways throughout the Gospel and refers to different entities (the Jewish leaders, a particular audience of Jesus, a more general reference etc.), but there is little evidence in this passage that indicates that it is a general term for Jesus' opponents as the term may be applied elsewhere in the Gospel (see 9:22; 12:42; 16:2). In these verses, the author depicts an opposition between Jesus and the 'Jews'. In Jn 2, however, there is no such identification and we should therefore be careful to say that the use of the word 'Jews' whenever applied indicates a rejection of the Jewish traditions.

4.5.4 *The First Temple Mentioned in Jn 2:14–17*

The first temple presented is the temple building in Jerusalem. In 2:14, the temple is mentioned twice, both when Jesus comes to the temple (2:14a) and when the author lists the objects normally connected to sacrifice in one or another way: cattle, sheep, doves, and moneychangers (2:14b). The temple orientation of the passage is thus accentuated. Nevertheless, what this accentuation meant to the author and his community is again, of course, relative to the overall function of the passage. I shall argue that when Jesus is placed within this context as a temple adherent, we must, at least *within 2:14–17*, perceive the cultus-orientation as an acceptance of the cultus, or a reference to such an acceptance on the first level.

The Johannine attitude towards the temple institution, i.e. as seen on the second level, becomes more difficult to analyse in connection with 2:15 where it is told that Jesus makes a whip, or something like a whip according to some manuscripts (see Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos et al. 1993:252). He then drives people out of the place, he pours out the money and speaks angrily to the dove sellers.

This could indicate that Jesus drives out the sacrificial animals and thus in principle declares the abrogation of the temple institution. Several scholars argue in this way, for example Schnackenburg (1971b:370), and Barrett (1978:198).⁶⁹ However, this is not as apparent as presumed. Πᾶς in the expression πάντας ἐξέβαλεν (2:15) indicates that not only the animals, but even the men were driven out (Barrett 1978:198). Chilton (1991:33) points, likewise, to the fact that the problem of the sentence is also that of position, as πάντες refers to personnel mentioned in verse 14. This observation more plausibly focuses on the trade rather than on the sacrifice, and indicates that the purification of the temple or a rejection of this kind of trade is in question. In addition, although Jesus tells the dove sellers to take their things away (cf. ἄρατε ταῦτα) in 2:16, the reasons given for the action focus once again on the trading, not on the presence or non-presence of the sacrificial animals per se. The fact that he uses a whip and not a stick, may attest that the author knows the prohibition of using sticks in the temple area.⁷⁰ If there were such a prohibition and if the author knew about it, the author would demonstrate his respect for this tradition.⁷¹

The reasons given for the actions by Jesus could also be described as *reforming* by the logion in 2:16b: μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου. His definition of the Herodian temple as the

⁶⁹ Barrett here refers to Jn 1:29 and concludes that 'John may have in mind the thought that animals are no longer needed for sacrifice in the presence of Jesus as the Lamb of God'. The precaution indicated by the word 'may' well demonstrates his uneasiness regarding the exegetical details here. Dodd (1953:300ff) thinks that the replacement idea is the main idea of 2:13–22 and that it is 'plain enough' (1953:301). He understands the cleansing of the temple as purging, by the expulsion of the sacrificial animals from its courts and that the text 'signifies the destruction and replacement of the system of religious observance of which the temple was the centre' (1953:301).

⁷⁰ Barrett (1978:197) refers to m. Ber. 9:5 and the use of לֹקֵחַ. It is of course doubtful whether this prohibition existed in the time of John. He also doubts the validity of this prohibition concerning those who were looking after the herds.

⁷¹ Adna (2000:179–180, n. 63) too, admits that the passage in John is alluding to purification rather than replacement, but since he is focused on the historical Jesus, the Johannine version may be explained by difficulties in the transition of the story:

Wahrscheinlich ist die Schwierigkeit überlieferungs- bzw. redaktionsgeschichtlich aufzulösen, indem sich die Apposition τὰ τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας als sekundäre Hinzufügung erkenntlich macht, die die Bezugsgrösse des πάντας gegenüber der vorgegebenen Überlieferung (= Verkäufer + Tiere) auf die Tiere allein einschränkt.

house of his Father (οἶκος τοῦ πατρός μου), further stresses his loyalty to the temple and defines the status of this temple, it is a place of divine presence (cf. the understanding of the temple in Schrenk 1965). The meaning of the preceding actions is defined by the words here spoken. This is not a direct Old Testament/Tanakh quotation, but it alludes perhaps to Zech 14:20ff (Hebrew Bible, not LXX) commenting on the trade in the temple, with a possible eschatological meaning that from the community's point of view is now considered fulfilled, as in 4:23 (ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν). A reforming of the temple could also be seen as inaugurating a new kind of temple worship,⁷² but the relationship between the new and old temple practice is nowhere stated clearly.

Without any synoptic similarities, the quotation in 2:17 is quite obviously editorial, as Ådna (2000:207) also concludes. The text quotes Ps 68:10 (LXX) but changes the tense of the verb from κατέφαγεν to καταφάγεται. The citation is derived from a much-applied psalm in the New Testament for christological support with its references to a 'righteous sufferer'.⁷³ The New Testament evidence for a widespread use of the psalm in the early church is clear enough, even in John, but there are reasons to doubt that such an understanding is involved here.⁷⁴ The function of the quotation in Jn 2:17 in relation to the temple attitude and the question of replacement of the temple by the community are not stated. Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998:74) argue that the missing part of the quotation is supposed to have been supplied by the audience and thereby the

⁷² The eschatological interpretation is also Ådna's solution (2000:205) when he argues that the allusion to Zechariah is a pre-Johannine reflection of a prophetic word now come true. He argues that it is a result of a conviction expressing an enlargement of the sanctity and that Jn 2:16b is temple friendly (2000:206).

⁷³ Cf. Jn 15:25 (Ps 69 v. 5a); Rom 15:3 (v. 10b); Mt 27:34 (v. 22a); Mt 27:48; Mk 15:36; Lk 23:36; Jn 19:28–30 (v. 22b).

⁷⁴ It was not generally expected that the Messiah should die, and the Christian claims might have wanted to meet this objection, see Borgen (1990:436); Lindars (1972:144); Schnackenburg (1971a:367); Haenchen (1980:203). Barrett (1978:198) argues that John thought that the Psalmist was speaking of Jesus. Dodd (1953:301) in contrast, in a kind of typological interpretation, sees an analogy between the righteous sufferer of the psalm and Jesus: 'The implication is that, just as the Righteous Sufferer of the Psalm paid the price of his loyalty to the temple, so the action of Jesus in cleansing the temple will bring him to grief'. There is no indication in the text towards such an interpretation and we should therefore keep to the most straightforward way of reading, as Barrett does, cf. Frühwald-König (1998:87).

author forced the attention to the missing part ('the insult of those who insult you has fallen on me'). The quotation therefore deals with the question of honour and shame. Jesus takes upon himself the task of restoring the honour of God, as trade generally (not only in the Temple) was regarded to be dishonest. The argument that the missing part is more important than the expressed part is not convincing, but the honour and shame issue is naturally a present one here. It is neither obvious that the citation links the cleansing with the passion narrative and accordingly, that it accounts for the arrest of Jesus as a result of his open protest against the temple (Lindars 1972:140).⁷⁵

Death is not indicated in the Psalm and Jesus' death is not directly mentioned before 2:19. The link between the meaning of *κατεσθίω* in 2:17 and the destruction of the temple interpreted as the 'body temple', could nonetheless indicate that the zeal is a symbol for the sufferings of Jesus referred to in the passion story. In that case, the whole temple cleansing story functions as a symbol for the predicted destruction of the 'body temple', as scholars like Kieffer (1987:70) and also Ådna (2000:198–206) argue. However, the future form in the expression (*καταφάγεται με*) reflects a natural change of the perfect tense of the citation and is not necessarily to be read as a prediction on Jesus' destiny (see Barrett 1978:201; Ulrichsen 2003:208–209). The comment in 2:17 concerning the disciples may also indicate temple adherence since it is rather his *own* eagerness (*ζήλος*) that will consume *him*, not his eagerness that will lead others to put him to death.⁷⁶ It is the use of the word 'zeal' that stresses the impression given by the preceding verses of Jesus' attachment to the temple, he may be described as someone who goes beyond the ordinary cultus partaker when presented as a 'Jew' who attacks what he deems

⁷⁵ Jesus seems rather to stand in a long tradition of temple criticism, as indicated in the Old Testament/Tanakh, referring either to a temple reform (cf. the reform of Hezekiah reported in 2 Chr 29–31) or even a more radical one of prophetic intention (Isa 66:1; Amos 5:25–27, cf. Acts 7:49–50). Criticism of the temple had long traditions in Judaism and was probably strengthened after the desecration of the temple in the time of the Maccabees, see Theissen (1999:140) who finds four temple critical groups among Jews at that time: Essenes, Samaritans, the movement of John the Baptist and Jesus, and Gentile Christians.

⁷⁶ *ζήλος* is a word that had a wide range of meanings, such as 'jealousy, pride and spirit', but as the good sense is more usual, 'eager rivalry and zeal' are more likely translations. See Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. (1940:755) and Bauer (1979:337).

unworthy. Schrenk is probably right when he argues that the passage is not intended as an act of irreligion (1965:243), but he also argues that this could mean that Jesus just did not want to give offence to 'Judaism'. Surely, at least John could not have been afraid of presenting Jesus as offending other 'Jews' since in 8:59, for instance, the 'Jews' are said to have picked up stones to throw at him, clearly indicating that Jesus was not afraid of offending them.⁷⁷ It is possible that John has the death of Jesus in mind here and we may connect it to 2:21 where the body of Jesus is presented to be a temple. However, the status of this body in relation to the Jerusalem temple is still unclear.

The picture of Jesus' adherence to the temple institution is strengthened by comparing the attitude with other statements in the Gospel that indicate Jesus' commitment towards the temple. In 18:20, Jesus proclaims his temple commitment in a summary of all his activity. The main point in 18:20 lies in the statement that he had spoken freely, and nothing had been secret, and 18:20 cannot for this reason bear witness to a rejection of these institutions on the part of Jesus. It is rather an example of his adherence to the temple—at least in one way—and can hardly be taken as an argument for a total rejection of the temple institution by the Johannine community.

I find it unlikely that the presentation of the temple adherence of Jesus indicates a break with the temple institution on the part of John and his community—at least in the first part of the story (2:13–16). Together with the criticism of the abuses in the temple, Jesus is presented by the author as a faithful and zealous temple devotee. There are, in fact, no indications this far that the temple sacrifices representing the present order of the temple religion are distorted by the actions of Jesus. Jesus' criticism in 2:16 does not mean that the temple stopped being his father's house after the trading had been disturbed. The section 2:14–17 is in itself best characterised as a presentation of the community's critical loyalty to the temple although it is difficult to ascertain the exact intentions.

⁷⁷ Similarly, Lindars (1972:138) argues that the phrase to which Jesus was protesting was the 'outward show of piety which insisted on a 'pure' coinage without corresponding purity of heart'. Lindars sees a connection to Mk 11:16 where Jesus is said to have 'tried to stop people from using the Temple precincts as a right of way (Mk 11.16)'. Beasley-Murray (1987:39) also supports the view that the mentioning of the zeal 'suggests a positive attitude to the temple, and not one of total rejection (contrary to the frequently held opinion)'.

4.5.5 *The Second Temple Mentioned in Jn 2:18–22*

The second temple is the body of Jesus as presented in 2:21. The major question is whether the first temple mentioned in this passage is in any way replaced or to what degree it has been replaced by the body temple of Jesus, and whether it also indicates an active abrogation of the temple by the Johannine Christians. The Johannine reflection is particularly evident in the comments of 2:21–22 presenting the misunderstanding of the ‘Jews’ in 2:20 as well as the solution to it. The challenge from the ‘Jews’ in 2:18–19 is most probably also a Johannine tradition of its own, a conclusion that is quite in accordance with the ‘case-debate’ scheme.⁷⁸

The answer of Jesus in 2:19 to the question of the ‘Jews’ reported in 2:18, could be understood within the same temple framework as noticed above. The ‘Jews’ get upset and demand a sign for his zealous actions, and Jesus is actually said to be willing to give this sign: λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν.⁷⁹ Against this background he may also be looked upon as a temple rebuilders, he is after all promising to rebuild the temple if they, the ‘Jews’ (second person plural), destroy it. The ‘Jews’ conceive what he promises to be impossible, referring to the great number of years the buildings had been under construction. If the passage had stopped at 2:20, it would again have accentuated Jesus’ true adherence to the temple institution; he cleanses the temple of what he deems unworthy, and afterwards he utters that he is willing to raise it up by himself if it were to be destroyed! Seen this way, Jn 2:18–20 is a positive recognition of the temple. The end function of the passage in relation to temple replacement is dependent on the function of the interpretative key (2:21 see further down).

The situation follows a common social matrix of challenge and riposte, also called ‘a game of wits’ (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:75, 147–148). The riposte seems to have been looked upon as successful by the disciples (see 2:23). For the post-Easter community the

⁷⁸ Ådna (2000:208–211) argues that the passage is pre-Johannine in origin, but stamped by the Evangelist’s editorial work. He does not see any difficulties in combining his own insights and the solution presented by Borgen (1990) concerning the ‘case-debate’ form of the passage (Ådna 2000:212).

⁷⁹ Although λύω also means ‘destroy’, the use of the word does not indicate in which way and its degree, whether temporarily or in a permanent way.

explanation in 2:21 is, however, even more important. The genitive τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ in 2:21 is probably an explanation of the preceding genitive τοῦ ναοῦ, saying that ‘he spoke of the temple—which is his body’, and 2:22 is repeating the word ἐγείρω from 2:19, observations demonstrating that the verses 2:21–22 point back to the prophecy of 2:19 in a formal manner. The mentioning of ὑψώω in 12:32 also indicates the connection between ‘being lifted’ and the resurrection. Ὑψώω and ἐγείρω in each passage do refer to the same object and the expression ὁ ναὸς οὗτος, in 2:19 is now seen as a reference to the ‘body temple’ and not primarily to the geographical temple. This observance explains the enigma the ‘Jews’ did not perceive, but it certainly raises new enigmas for us. That the use of the metaphor ‘temple’ for a body was common can be inferred from a large range of texts, both in the New Testament⁸⁰ and other (Jewish) texts.⁸¹ Since it is so common, it is difficult to take the New Testament passages as the only background for an explanation of the explicit Johannine usage. Although other New Testament passages might bear witness to a similar transference of the meaning of the temple to non-geographical areas and may be used as an example of parallel phenomena (Gärtner 1965:142), they cannot be employed as direct keys to the idea and situation in the Johannine community. The main problem with the Johannine passage from my sociological point of view is again that it does not reveal how the author looked upon the relationship between the two temples he after all presents, i.e. the temple of Jerusalem and the body of Jesus.

2:21–22 clearly presents the post-Easter understanding of the saying of Jesus. 2:19 is thus reflexively turned into a prophecy that from the point of view of the author had already been accomplished. At

⁸⁰ Elsewhere in the New Testament ναός is used to denote the Christian *church* particularly (Eph 2:19–21; 4:12; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17), the individual body of a Christian (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19), or as a heavenly figure (Rev 11:19; 21:22; Heb 9:11–12). Paul’s use of the metaphor οἰκία (2 Cor 5:1) for the earthly and celestial body may also have some parallel structures.

⁸¹ The Qumran writing 4QFlor 1, 1:6 uses the מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם (‘a temple of man’) which might refer to the community, הַיְיחָד (the ‘Yahad’ or ‘union’, e.g. in 1QS 6:3, see below). In Philo Opif. 137, the body of the first man is described as a νεὸς ἱερός for the reasonable soul. This first man was not an ordinary man, he was the ideal perfect man and a creation unblemished in the times of Eden. See my discussion of the observations on Philo and Qumran writings presented in the subsequent chapters.

the time of the writing of the comments in 2:21–22, Jesus had been crucified and the author thus indirectly declares that he believes him to have risen from the dead, and in this way, he is also connecting the two statements about the temple in 2:19 and 20.

The temporal expression ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις may just refer to a ‘short period of time’ and thus not yet accomplished and then with a possible eschatological meaning (cf. Hos 6:2). Likewise, the temple prophecy of 2:19 could be understood as a future event even from a post-Easter perspective. Schrenk (1965:244) argues in relation to the historical Jesus, that the saying in 2:19

constitutes an unaffaced sign that Jesus did not merely affirm the sanctity of the cultus, but that He also looked forward to a perfected worship in the coming time of the Messianic Son of Man.

The same could be said *mutatis mutandis* about John, i.e. on the second level. The future form ἐγερῶ in 2:19, however, is repeated in 2:20 in the form of ἐγερεῖς and in 2:22 as ἡγέρθη, a fact that clearly links these verses together, indicating that the rebuilding is interpreted as nothing but the (past) resurrection of Jesus. It is certainly the ‘body temple’ that now has become the object of the saying in 2:19, but what did it mean to John and his community as seen from the second level perspective? If we could gain an understanding of this transference of the temple, we should also be in a better position to judge the meaning of it for the author and the community, in addition to the social consequences this meaning constitutes and from which it was constituted. There are two issues that are relevant from my point of view: the connection between case- and debate-parts and the possible double entendre in 2:19. Jn 2:21 certainly refers back to 2:19, but could it refer to the event-part as well? Can we still call the passage 2:14–16 a ‘temple adherence passage’ in view of our newly gained knowledge of the interpretative key?

Indeed, the compositional pattern case-debate suggests that there are connections of different sorts between the two passages. There is a topical connection between 2:17 and 2:19, procured by the connection between ἱερόν in 2:14, οἶκος in 2:16–17, and ναός in 2:20. In addition, there is a formal resemblance between 2:17, 22 in that they both comment on what the disciples remembered, and both present a scriptural reference, directly in 2:17 and indirectly in 2:22. However, to see a radical replacement doctrine presented here meets

several difficulties. *Ναός* or *ἱερόν* used as a metaphor to designate *σῶμα* does not function very well in the first part (2:13–16) as Jesus in this part is not presented as threatening the temple buildings, he is only presented as one who criticises and takes action against what he considers to be a wrong practice in these buildings. Nevertheless, there could be a double entendre in 2:17 as well, since the genitive *τοῦ οἴκου σου* alludes both to a ‘body temple’ and to the geographical temple, and since 2:22 focuses on the use of scripture. ‘The scripture’ (*ἡ γραφή* in singular) generally refers to a particular passage of scripture (Barrett 1978:201), and the citation in 2:17 is a good candidate for a reference to ‘scripture’ in 2:22, but it is not a good candidate for a double entendre in 2:17.

A related problem is the indication that the body temple of Jesus (2:21) is to be read into the case-part. 2:22 not only focuses on the scripture, but also on what Jesus said, and there are two words by Jesus in the passage, 2:16 and 19. Could the dissolution presented by the word *λύω* in 2:19 then be taken to refer both to the geographical temple and the body of Jesus in 2:17, while in 2:19 only to the body of Jesus? Taken as presentation of the temple attitude in the Johannine community the key verse (2:21) presents two main alternatives. Either it is the ‘body temple’ only, that has now become the object of the saying of Jesus—an interpretation that indicates very little replacement involved. Alternatively, there might also be a double entendre in 2:19, saying that

if you tear down this geographical temple, I shall raise up a new one,
that is a body temple and this temple takes the place of the former.

This suggestion faces three difficulties. First, it is partly based upon the idea found in Mk 14:58 about ‘the temple not made by hands’, an idea not found in John and for that reason not particularly interesting in this connection.⁸² We do find an idea of a worship in ‘spirit and truth’ in 4:23–24 (see also below), but the idea of a non-physical temple and worship is wanting and the resurrected body of Jesus is clearly presented as physical at the end of the Gospel (20:27). Second, the objects of the two sentences, *λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον* and *ἐγερῶ αὐτόν*, have one and the same reference—the geographical temple or later interpreted to be the body of Jesus, and 2:21

⁸² See also the evaluation of the use of Mk 14:58 below.

does not say that Jesus was referring to both temples at the same time. As in all other passages containing misunderstandings in the Gospel of John, the misunderstanding in this passage is also corrected by the author.⁸³ Third, the 'Jews' are described as misunderstanding when they take Jesus to refer to the geographical temple. By seeing a reference to the Jerusalem temple here, we put ourselves in the place of the misunderstanding audience. The use of the interpretive key is then perhaps best limited to the debate-part in a way that takes the debate away from the original meaning still present in the case. The sign the 'Jews' demand is nothing but the resurrection as seen from the final author, but there is little replacement involved when Jesus' answer is presented with a key of interpretation. Nevertheless, there is a certain vagueness and ambivalence involved. This ambivalence may be explained by the fact that the community had been forced to adjust to a situation without a temple. It can also be explained by the fact that the temple had such a vital importance in Jewish practice and belief both before and after the destruction that it could not suddenly be completely abandoned even if they were theologically prepared for such a replacement.

The ambiguity of the passage is often observed, but seldom reflected in the conclusions. Koester (1995:82–85) argues in favour of a replacement theory although he says that 'The text makes clear that Jesus' body is a temple, but does not explain how he functions as a temple', he argues, but nevertheless thinks that several aspects of meaning can be inferred from the context (1995:83). The function of the sacrifice, which was integral to the Jerusalem temple, is fulfilled and replaced by Jesus because the temple cleansing meant temporarily disrupting the temple and, accordingly, foreshadowed the permanent cessation and replacement, Koester argues (1995:84). This can also be inferred from the fact that Jesus in 1:29 is presented as 'the lamb of God' and from the fact that the transformation of the water in the preceding story of the wedding at Cana is identified with Jesus' death as the new means of purification, Koester concludes. In connection with the temple cleansing proper, Lindars (1972:137) concludes that

⁸³ See Leroy (1968) and also my chapter 7 below. Leroy operates with 10 passages of misunderstandings in John: 1) 2:19–22; 2) 3:3–5; 3) 4:10–15; 4) 4:31–34; 5) 6:32–35, 41–42; 6) 6:51–53; 7) 7:33–36; 8) 8:21–22; 9) 8:31–33; 10) 8: 51–53, 56–58.

This does not necessarily entail a rejection of Temple and cultus as such, but it does mean a radical criticism of the presuppositions on which they are maintained.

Concerning the body as temple, Lindars (1972:144) argues that 'John is thinking of the *consecration* of Jesus' body (see 17,19), and so of his death as the new and sufficient sacrifice.' The sign that Jesus gives is the resurrection. From my point of view, the connection seen by Lindars between 2:17, 2:19, and 2:22 is only probable up to a certain point. John is not clearly referring to the death of Jesus in 2:17, but his death is at least indicated by 2:19 and 2:21. Jn 2:21 demonstrates that the temple building is transferred to Jesus' body, but we are not justified to conclude that this is a decisive proof of an emancipation of or an abrogation with the temple on the part of John. Koester (1995:82–85) also argues that since God was supposed to be dwelling in the temple, Jesus' promise of a 'new' temple in 2:19 indicates that God's glory will be manifested in Jesus. He thinks that the 'risen body' of Jesus became the unifying symbol in John just as the temple had been before, particularly when seen in connection with the allusions to all nations in connection with the reference to Zech 14:21 in Jn 2:16.⁸⁴ However, the reference to the nations in Zechariah is indirect in John, and if the 'body temple' indicates a new unifying temple of all nations, this does not indicate that the other temple was disregarded. The argument may defend the thesis that the geographical temple had been rendered superfluous, but not in any way seriously rejected.

Moreover, contra Koester, I find it difficult to see how the 'body temple' of Jesus is presented as a new temple in 2:13–22, equivalent to the temporal temple, and as a substitute to it. The body temple of Jesus is of a different kind and we have no direct statements explaining its relationship with the Jerusalem temple. The temple image represents transference of the temple idea to the body of Jesus, but the transference inherent in the metaphor does not in itself make it probable that John reflects a rejection of the geographical Jerusalem temple as a natural consequence. The definition of the 'body tem-

⁸⁴ Zech 14:16 mentions the nations. Koester argues that the replacement occurred before the destruction: 'In his crucified and risen body the promise was fulfilled; he became a sanctuary that transcended and replaced other places of worship (cf. 4:21) and endured beyond the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (cf. 11:48) to unite the community of those called to worship in Spirit and truth' (Koester 1995:85).

ple' of Jesus does not indicate in itself that the other temple and the sacrifices were abrogated. The statements of replacement are again missing, a fact that we have to take seriously. The scriptural quotations mentioned by Koester (1995:84)⁸⁵ that bear witness to an anticipation of a new temple to which God's glory is moved, refer to a new geographical temple. The 'body temple' of Jesus cannot, however, in any way be physical or geographical in the same way as the Jerusalem temple was.⁸⁶ The non-physical character of the body-temple may nevertheless be related to the 'body temple', and presents to us two kinds of temples, a physical and geographical one (relating to the Jerusalem Herodian temple) and another, more unspecified one (relating to the body of Jesus). The different nature of the Jerusalem temple and the body of Jesus also indicates that they might have co-existed, and the latter not necessarily replaced. John mentions the temple five times in the passage telling the Johannine version of the story of the temple cleansing. From the viewpoint of the author and the alleged Johannine community there are evidently only two temple references in the passage, *the geographical temple*, and *the 'body temple' of Jesus*. 2:14–17 presents the geographical temple and the relationship of Jesus to the temple in Jerusalem. 2:22 demonstrates that the temple Jesus was to rebuild was his σῶμα. According to the author, the resurrection has brought new christological insights, the body of Jesus is not only identified as a temple, but Jesus was in fact alluding to his own death and resurrection in 2:19. The post-Easter understanding does not, however, imply a strict replacement of the Jerusalem temple.

4.5.6 *Thematic Context*

I have taken as my point of departure scholarly opinions concerning some key passages in John and their contexts, both outside and

⁸⁵ Exod 40:34; 1 Kgs 8:10–11; Ezek 10:18–19; 11:22–23; 43:1–5.

⁸⁶ The resurrected body is described in Jn 20–21. Jn 20:11–18 describes Jesus in physical terms, Mary could see and hear him and thought he was a gardener (20:17). Jn 20:19 describes the resurrected Jesus in physical terms as the disciples are able to see and hear him. This fact is repeated in 20:26 where Thomas could put his hand in the side of Jesus. Jn 21 tells us that Jesus eats breakfast. The nature of the resurrected body of Jesus is nevertheless uncertain. There is also something non-physical about his form, as John tells us that Jesus came through shut doors (20:19), and John never tells us how he ascended to his Father, although this is alluded to twice in 20:17. The resurrected body is understood as something peculiar and sometimes as non-physical or unexplainable.

inside the New Testament. The general methodological problem in the inclusion of the context is that nowhere else is Jesus' body described as a temple. This fact leads us to look for possible *related* ideas only, not direct parallels. The most obvious place to look is the temple discussion in Jn 4, a passage analysed further down.

1. *Jn 1:14, 17 and the Glory of God*

For several scholars the conclusive arguments in favour of the superiority of the new temple and even abrogation of the old as an institution is found in general statements of the prologue, particularly in 1:14 and 1:17. A general problem with the prologue used to enlighten the rest of the Gospel is that it becomes clear only in the light of the whole Gospel (see Pancaro 1975:534) and we end up with a circular argument.

A replacement message may particularly be promoted if we can demonstrate a special (hidden) connection between the verb σκηνώνω and the noun δόξα in 1:14 seen against the Hebrew background of these terms. Σκηνώνω is also used in the Septuagint, recalling in sound and meaning the Hebrew שָׁכַן (to dwell). The verb is used in connection with the dwelling of God with Israel (e.g. Exod 25:8) and the derived noun שְׁכִינָה is applied in a periphrasis for the name of Lord. The abiding presence of God upon the Tabernacle (Exod 24:16) suggested his glory (Exod 25:7) his כְּבוֹד or δόξα. In that case, this would more than indicate the rejection of traditional Judaism by the part of the Johannine community too. However, there are several observations that are not in favour of this conclusion. Barrett excludes the possibility arguing that שְׁכִינָה means more 'the presence of God' than 'glory' and argues that שָׁכַן is not regularly represented by (κατα)σκηνώνω (1978:164–165). 'Probably John means no more than that the Word took up a temporary residence among men', Barrett (1978:165–166) rightly argues. Further, the preposition ἐν in the expression ἐν ἡμῖν raises some problems since it could be translated 'in us' and not 'among us'.

1:14 is often read in connection with 1:17 that also mentions the grace and truth (ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια). Jesus may here be seen as contrasted to the Law (Barrett 1978:169) but one may ask how far the negation of the Law in that case may reach? Since it is almost impossible to know whether the two parts of 1:17 (the Law of Moses and the grace and truth of Jesus) are to be read synthetically or antithetically (Pancaro 1975:537), we have no secure reference to a

general neglect of the Law, nor implicitly the temple as an institution prescribed by this Law. Schnelle (1987:42–43) argues that the word pair *χάρις καὶ ἀλήθεια* in 1:14 must be understood antithetically in relation to the alternative and that this antithetical understanding should determine the reading of 1:17 as well. However, the meaning of 1:14 is still quite ambiguous when seen as a testimony of the temple relationship of the Johannine community (see also the discussion in my chapter 6).

In addition, we have to consider why John presents Jesus operating in the temple several times after the declarations of 1:14, 17 and also 2:13–22. In 18:20, John also lets Jesus use this temple practice of his as an argument in his self-defence. If we take the redaction-critical stance seriously, the claim that John in the prologue contradicts a practice described later is open to question. We should rather see Jesus' presence in the temple as John recounts it as an argument for saying that there is no rejection involved in the prologue either. This is in fact the easiest reading. At least in the case with Jesus himself from the point of view of John, the characteristics of him being a 'temple' and 'the place of God's glory', do not hinder John from presenting Jesus visiting the temple and participating in the celebration. This may be looked upon as a result of the tradition the author or redactor could not change. However, the support of the temple as indicated by these other passages is not as ambivalent as the doctrinal formulation of 1:14 and they refer to practice, which is sociologically much more significant. With a reading that takes 1:14 as demonstrating that the community had rejected the temple institution in principle and neglected in practice, the problem remains that there are no explicit temple replacement statements in the prologue and thereby little that expresses the community's neglect of the temple institution in this general introduction to the Gospel.

2. Indications of a General Sacrificial Christology

Schnackenburg argues that the explanation in 2:21 as well as the prophecy of the destruction and reconstruction of the temple, assume a christological meaning as Jesus gives his body voluntarily to destruction, but in three days is resurrected. Jn 10:18 (οὐδεὶς αἶρει αὐτήν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτήν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ κτλ.) suggests a similar way of thinking, Schnackenburg argues. Jesus thus becomes the true house of God ('das wahre 'Haus Gottes'). John also uses

christological metaphors elsewhere in the Gospel to strengthen the hypothesis; Jesus is the fountain of the streams of life (19:34; 7:38) and the true vine (15:4–8), according to Schnackenburg (1971b:367).

The combination made by Schnackenburg of 2:21 with 1:51 and 4:23, leads to similar ideas found in Mt 12:6 saying that Jesus represents something greater than the temple. However, this idea does not reveal much about the temple attitude in the Johannine community. The use of parallel metaphors can only explain the special status of Jesus; they do not include the logical requirements of a complete replacement statement. Schnackenburg (1971b:371) is right in rejecting that the Pauline thought (Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 12:12–27 et al.) of the church members as the body of Christ, since this image of the body of Christ cannot be read conclusively from the Gospel of John (contra Dodd). It is possible, as Barrett (1978:201) argues, but it cannot be read out of the Gospel of John, which again makes any social consequences and sociological conclusions derivable from these texts dubious.

According to Kieffer (1987:70), the sufferings of Jesus alluded to in Jn 2:17 symbolically describe the sufferings leading to his death. He argues that the temple cleansing becomes a metaphor for a temple disruption, symbolically applied to the body of Jesus. The resurrection of Jesus is the sign that authorises him to cleanse the temple, but Kieffer rightly points to the fact that what the sign means is not stated manifestly, except that we are prepared by the story of the wedding at Cana to look for a deeper meaning whenever a sign is mentioned. It is possible, as Kieffer argues, that the temple cleansing symbolically points to the body of Jesus that is to be destroyed and rebuilt. It is also possible that the marginal notes of the story referring to a 'Passover' establish a connection with earlier claims that Jesus is the lamb of God (1:29, 36). Jesus is presented both as the lamb of God and as a temple, but how can we conclude that this new non-geographical temple has replaced and invalidated the old geographical one in the Johannine community? If the replacement is never fully stated, we can hardly argue that the post-Easter Johannine community had departed from the temple institution for good. Generally, the far-reaching symbolism that so many a scholar discovers in John lacks a firm textual basis. Anyway, it is too vague to be used as a basis for conclusive arguments regarding social consequences and practice.

This vagueness is evident in the arguments of Kieffer (1987:70) who links the replacement theory with an interpretation of the ascending/descending myth of 1:51. He sees a connection between the symbolism in 2:21 (the body of Jesus as a new temple) and the Bethel story. Jesus is the new 'house of God' that replaces the Bethel where Jacob is told to have had his revelation. However, there are some problems in connecting these two passages. First, one must take into consideration that the human body often was looked upon as a temple (clearly demonstrated by Paul and Philo). By using the image on the body of Jesus, John is not presenting Jesus as a new temple for that reason alone, there should be other indications as well—which in fact there are not. Secondly, Kieffer has not considered the problems lying in the differences of nature of the two temples and the possibility that many early Christians saw little difficulty in offering sacrifice at the temple.⁸⁷

Ådna (2000) has undertaken an investigation of temple relationship in connection with the historical Jesus and the early church, including the Gospel of John.⁸⁸ He argues on the basis of the Messianic character of the temple act ('cleansing') that Jesus himself intended to replace the sacrificial cultus by his atoning death. The historical Jesus himself wanted to build the new eschatological temple making the former more or less invalid (1993:575; 2000:433). The new temple, 'not made with hands' is made real through the 'ekklesia', that is the personal gathering of the new people of God, Ådna concludes (2000:446). However, Ådna too admits that the replacement was probably not complete.⁸⁹ As a house of prayer, the temple still had a function for the first Christians (Ådna 1999:470; cf. Hengel 1981:57), and he joins Hengel (1981:52) in saying that the temple mount at

⁸⁷ Barrett (1978:187) also rejects speculations concerning a thematic connection between Jesus and Jacob in Jn 1:51: 'To say that Jesus as the Son of man is the 'second Jacob, i.e. the true Israel in his own person' (Sanders) goes too far; Nathanael is the 'Israelite indeed'.'

⁸⁸ See the studies by Ådna (1989; 1993; 2000). He promises a forthcoming volume on the temple practice of the Jerusalem early church and of the temple theology in the early church generally (2000:7).

⁸⁹ In his dissertation, Ådna (1993:559) argues that the atoning sacrifice by Jesus replaced the whole temple: 'Der gegen den Sühnopferkult im Tempel gerichteten sühnethnologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu stehen Theologumena zur Seite, die das Ende und die Ersetzung nicht nur des Opferkultes, sondern des ganzen Tempels aussagen'. He is leaning on theories and results from Stuhlmacher of Tübingen.

Zion had *not lost all its functions*, it had in fact become ‘the universal centre of all synagogues’, preserving some synagogal functions for the temple (Ådna 1993:555).

There are several differences between my study and studies like those of Brown, Barrett, Ådna et al., studies that investigate the particular position of the historical Jesus towards the temple, i.e. the historicity of the incidents in question. By focusing primarily on the post-Easter period and the Johannine community with all its particularities, I am asking other questions than these scholars. By asking sociological questions, I am also using a different perspective by introducing the notion of ‘institutional approach’ to the field, i.e. to see if and how the Johannine community broke with the temple as a central Jewish institution. However, when scholars like Ådna and Hengel also admit that the temple had other functions they have in principle also opened the field for my perspective.

3. *Greater Than the Temple*

The superiority of Jesus and what he represented according to John have been inferred from passages in John and compared to places like Mt 12:6 mentioned above, and the claim that Jesus represents something ‘greater than the temple’ in the phrase λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μείζον ἐστὶν ὁ θεός. A similar superiority is found in 1:50 μείζω τούτων ὄψη and 5:36 ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου.⁹⁰

Several scholars also link the statements in 2:13–22 to the eschatological idea found in Rev 21:22 that there will be no temple in the new heaven because God himself is present. Schrenk (1965:244) argues that the passage 4:21–24 demonstrates that John linked his christological interpretation of 2:21 with the idea of the new worship, referring to evidence of Rev 21:22. What is interesting in his position is that to secure the conclusion he suggests a link between this saying and the temple saying in Mt 12:6. Brown (1966:124–125) argues that the interpretation of John is similar to the one found in Mark, implying that John interprets Jesus as ‘the new temple’, referring also to Mt 12:6.⁹¹ Commenting on the temple cleansing in

⁹⁰ Compare the similar construction with μείζων in 4:12 and 8:53 (it also used in 5:20; 13:16; 15:20, but not directly on the position of Jesus).

⁹¹ See also Bultmann (1971:189). ‘As an indication that John’s interpretation of Jesus as the new Temple is not strange in the framework of Gospel theology, we

connection with 4:23–24, Brown (1966:180) concludes that Jesus in 2:13–22 also speaks of the eschatological replacement of temporal institutions.

The saying in Mt 12:6, only concerns superiority, however, and the expected next step in the chain of arguments, the rejection or abrogation is not stated. The problem is not the word ‘new’ or even ‘superiority’. The important question is whether the statements involved reflect the final departure of the Johannine community from traditional temple worship. From my point of view Mt 12:6 points to a less radical conclusion. When one entity is declared greater than the other, the second one is implicitly declared to be still valuable in some way. In addition, *John* does not declare superiority of the ‘body temple’ against the Jerusalem temple. What 2:21 clearly says is that the temple body of Jesus is a temple, but we do not know whether it is *a* temple or *the* temple. As argued above, when 2:19 uses words like λύω and ἐγείρω it is not possible to say that the words allude to the geographical temple.

4. *A Temple Not Made with Hands*

There are possible connections between the claim in Mk 14:58 about the temple ‘made without hands’ (ἀχειροποίητος) and the temple destruction prophecy in 2:19 and its explanation in 2:21 as mentioned. One may use the expression in Mark to explain the Johannine idea and the Johannine passage would in that case demonstrate at least a theoretical replacement of institutions.

One problem with using Mk 14:58 in this connection is that the saying is attributed to false witnesses (ψευδομαρτυρέω—see also Mt 26:59–61 and Acts 6:13–14). Ådna (2000:116) argues that the prophecy ‘sehr wahrscheinlich’ may be traced back to Jesus himself. The saying in the Gospel of Matthew is somewhat ambiguous as the writing first presents to us the false witnesses, and only then presents the other witnesses who claim that Jesus had uttered the prophecy of destruction. A similar doubt may also be seen in Mk 14:57–58, and we are left with the impression that Jesus had uttered the prophecy in accordance with the Johannine version. This conclusion will in any case not be in conflict with my general solution concerning

may recall the saying attributed to Jesus in Matt xii:6: ‘A greater than the Temple is here’ (Brown 1966:125).

temple relationship in the Johannine community. When Dodd (1953: 300ff) argues that the replacement idea is 'plain enough' in John, and he uses Mk 14:58 as a basis concerning the temple that is both ἀχειροποιήτος and χειροποιήτος, expressions representing a known tradition in the first churches. One may for instance compare this image with the temple metaphors of the church in Paul. In 2 Cor 6:16, Paul declares that Christians are a temple for God, cf. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος. Commenting on 2:19, Dodd argues that the identification of the temple with the body of Christ in no way is forced, but implicit in the tradition

since the process by which the transition is made from the old to the new is identical with the process of Christ's death and resurrection.

Accordingly, 1 Cor 3:16; 12:27 declare that the members of the church constitute a temple and body of Christ, and Eph 2:21; 4:12 declare that Jesus is a sacred temple and the Christians an abode of the Lord in spirit. Such parallels would make the instructed reader able to understand that 'the new order in religion which Christ inaugurates is that of the Church which is His Body' (Dodd 1953:302).

These statements may perhaps reflect a common perspective by that part of the early church that argued for a neglect of the temple, an idea often attributed to the Hellenistic church and demonstrated by Stephen in Acts 7. However, again the degree of actual neglect of the temple institution in *John* particularly is not easy to evaluate.

4.5.7 *Three Possible Kinds of Relationships*

On the one hand, we see that the question of the temple buildings in Jerusalem is a concern of the passage 2:18–22, at least by the misunderstanding audience. On the other hand, 2:13–17 treats an aspect of the sacrificial system, the trading at or near the temple. These parts are linked together as the second part of the passage (the 'debate') comments on the first part (the 'case') but not in such a way that the 'body temple' is said to render the entire Jerusalem temple institution without value. There are therefore few indications so far in the course of exegesis of the Gospel of John that lead to the conclusion that the Johannine Christians had replaced the traditional temple institution with the worship of Jesus and for that reason would have neglected or abandoned the celebrations in the

Jerusalem temple tout court—if it had still been there. The passage 2:13–22 does not declare that Jesus has rejected the temple and the sacrifices in principle.

We may in fact discern altogether three main possibilities of relationship between the community and the temple institution in the passage and three possible relations may be described as three different models of a community in tension with the temple institution:

1. A *rejection model*, a strongly anti-temple group, indicating a protest and break with the temple institution in principle and in practice,
2. An *acceptance model*, indicating no break in principle nor in practice with the temple institution (only difference and disagreement), and
3. A *conjunction model*, a 'laissez-faire' attitude, indicating break in some way theoretically (e.g. re-interpretation), a fact that in principle makes the temple institution redundant, but there is no break in practice, it is not neglected in a significant way.

'Rejection' is a possibility because the statement of a temple transference from the geographical temple to the 'body temple' of Jesus may be seen together with the major importance of death and resurrection of Jesus also indicated in that passage. 'Acceptance' is, however, also a possible inferred relationship since the author at the same time does not declare that Jesus and his disciples stopped worshipping and celebrating in the temple. 'Conjunction' is also a possibility because the ambiguity or uncertain meaning revealed in the passage might reflect a corresponding ambivalence where the temple institution in principle was looked upon as superfluous but in practice not necessarily to be abandoned or neglected.

These models partly reflect the three different Jewish-Christian attitudes, mentioned above. In terms of my overall sociological theories, these models may be taken to present different degrees of tension with temple Judaism: a relatively high degree of tension is reflected when rejection is involved, a relatively low degree of tension when acceptance is a likely description, while the conjunction model lies somewhere in between on that scale. The three relational models above do not in themselves represent clear cut sociological types as 'cult and sect', since the definitions of these models are based on the question of nature of rejection (innovation versus refurbishment). However, a group that is placed under the category of

acceptance relationship can hardly represent the high-tension ‘cult and sect’ models.

At this point of my investigation, I have not presented enough information to reach a verdict concerning which of these options most probably characterises the Johannine community. The temple cleansing passage 2:13–17 demonstrates a high-tension refurbishing attitude. The definition of Jesus’ body as a temple without further replacement statements as reported in the passage 2:18–20 indicates neither high tension nor a complete break although the situation in which it is placed is reported to have been tense. I do not see the re-interpretation presented in 2:21 as a re-interpretation of the temple, but of the statement concerning the temple destruction and therefore may have been reducing tension with the environment of the Johannine community. The passage itself only alludes to a replacement of the temple buildings and its subsequent functions. *Critical acceptance* in a conjunction model is the most suitable notion for describing the temple relationship in the Johannine community if we were to confine our analysis to 2:13–22 alone. A final conclusion concerning the categorisation of the community in relation to the modern sociological models, can only be drawn after further analysis of other temple transference in the Gospel and after the comparisons.

The Samaritan encounter in Jn 4 seems in the first instance to state more directly the Johannine attitude towards the temple worship as a total replacement. The discussion will show that in the Samaritan story of Jn 4, several scholars find a passage demonstrating a fundamental rejection of all geographical temples. Together with the temple statements in Jn 4, the temple cleansing story in fact may turn out to present a more tense situation for the community.

4.6 THE PROPER PLACE AND MODE OF WORSHIP IN JN 4

4.6.1 *Another Two Temples and Two Kinds of Worship*

By way of contents, we may divide the section Jn 4:1–42 into five parts: introduction, conclusion, and three passages with different discussions. The passage 4:20–24 is part of the second discussion between the Samaritan woman and Jesus in 4:16–26.⁹² The preceding pas-

⁹² A possible outline of the passage is:

sage, 4:1–19, also contains statements concerning their relations to the Samaritans, and the entire passage tells the story of the Samaritan encounter, incorporating a possible reference to missionary activity (4:34–38). These features, the relationship to Samaritans as an out-group, and the missionary activity, shall be discussed in chapter 7 in connection with the analysis of the general relationship to ‘outsiders’ in John.

The temple theme in 2:13–22 is centred on the sacrifice, seen through the alleged criticism of temple trade by Jesus in 2:14–16(17), and the temple building (2:19–21). In 4:1–42, the temple theme is, above all, the worship of the Father. Προσκυνέω is an important word in this connection.⁹³ Commenting on the cleansing passage in connection with 4:20–24, Brown argues that the opposition to Jerusalem and Gerizim as places of worship (expressed by 4:21) demonstrates that Jesus also in 2:13–22 is speaking of an eschatological replacement of temporal institutions (1966:180), a judgement he follows up later. In his 1994 commentary on the passion narratives in the four gospels, Brown again draws in 4:20–24 to argue for a replacement: ‘Given

-
1. Introduction (4:1–6; a. 4:1–2; b. 4:3–6)
 2. first discussion, concerning water (4:7–15)
 3. second discussion, concerning the true worshippers (4:16–26)
 4. intermediate discussion, concerning harvesting (4:27–38)
 5. concluding remarks, concerning adherence to Jesus as the saviour of the cosmos (4:39–42).

For other outlines, see Okure (1988). Finding other formal structures than an outline based upon contents is difficult, see e.g. the criticism of Okure in Carson (1991:214). Part 3 is the main part for this analysis. Parts 1 and 2 are drawn in as the relationship between the two groups in question, the ‘Jews’ and the Samaritans, is presented, and thus needed for my analysis of the discussion concerning worship. Part 5, Jn 4:39–42, particularly Jn 4:42, is drawn in to analyse the impact of the conclusions to the precedent verses, while part 4, the intermediate section Jn 4:27–38, is of less value for this analysis and thus omitted.

⁹³ The word itself may denote both ‘to fall down and worship’ and ‘welcome respectfully’ with accusative or dative alternatively (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940:1518). The word is used 11 times, 9 times in Jn 4, but only in the section 4:20–24, in addition it is used in Jn 9:38; 12:20. Jn 9:38 is the only place the word is not connected to the temple worship in John. This means that the word is used mostly in Jn 4, clearly indicating the importance of the meaning of the word for John, in general and in Jn 4 in particular. Τὸ προσκυνεῖν may generally involve several of the temple functions and ways of prostrating oneself to God in the temple, including prayer, attending the services, sacrificing, etc. Generally it refers to cultic worship (Bultmann 1971:189, n. 3), but here it probably means nothing but ‘to do him reverence’ (Barrett 1978:365). Morris (1995:236, n. 46) argues, as do many scholars, that the differences between the accusative and dative construction should not be stressed here.

Israelite thought about God's presence among the covenanted people, there would surely have been a notion of replacement of some sort' (1994:455, n. 38). Schnackenburg (1971a:356ff) connects the temple cleansing in Jn 2 with the Samaritan dialogue in an attempt to find a deeper symbolic meaning,⁹⁴ and combines this connection with the Johannine attitude towards the Law in general. He argues that Jesus supersedes the Jewish cultus seen from the general focus on Jesus in the Gospel that these passages indicate.⁹⁵ There are similar allusions to Jewish rites in the wedding at Cana (2:6), the references to the sacrificial animals in 2:14 and the conversation with the Samaritan woman in 4:20–24 about the true place of worship. This fact is also demonstrated in 1:17, a statement that tends to manifest the abrogation, Schnackenburg argues (1971b:370). When Barrett (1978:201) draws in the temple passages in Jn 2 and Jn 4 in combination with other textual evidence, he points to the fact that all similar usages outside John are quite different from the one in 2:21, and thus irrelevant. He discusses several issues: the use of building or temple as metaphors for a community in Qumran, the thought of the human body as a shrine (1 Cor), the first made man as a shrine for the reasonable soul (Philo), the soul itself as a house of God (Philo) or similar metaphors in other texts in which the body is a dwelling place (Stoics). The thought found in John is not concerned with the relation of the human soul to God, Barrett argues, but on the unique mutual indwelling of God and Jesus, as for instance the statement in 14:10 indicates (cf. ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐστίν). He concludes, however, not only that 'the human body of Jesus was the place where a unique manifestation of God took place' but also that it 'consequently became the *only true Temple, the only centre of true worship*, cf. 4:20–4' (italics mine).

There is evidently a unique relationship between the Father and the Son presented in John, but is the conclusion that the worship of Jesus is now the only *place or mode* of worship for the community?

Although 2:13–22 and 4:1–42 both take up a common subject, the temple, they do so in different ways. It is significant in light of

⁹⁴ 'Die Frage nach einer tieferen symbolischen Deutung' (Schnackenburg 1971a:370).

⁹⁵ Schnackenburg (1971a:370) refers to the view of Origen in addition to these scholars who are in agreement with him: Strathmann, Dodd, Barrett, Lightfoot and Haenchen.

my overall perspective that we have both a presentation of its proper place (4:20–22), and also of its proper manner or mode (4:23–24). In 2:13–22, two temples are present, the Jerusalem temple and the ‘body temple’ of Jesus. In this section, two temple locations are presented: mount Gerizim and Jerusalem (4:21). Two kinds of worship are also stated: the worship at these two geographically located temples on the one side and the true or ‘pneumatic’ worship (4:24) on the other. The section shall be analysed as a witness to the Johannine attitude towards the traditional temple institution, thus the main question to take into consideration is the possible historical connection between the two kinds of temple worship. It is exactly the correlation between the question of the proper place and the question of the proper mode of worship that makes it possible to connect the theme of this passage with the theme of 2:13–22 (the body of Jesus as a temple). The question of where to worship God is the main connection in this passage to my discussion of the status of the temple institution in the Johannine community.

4.6.2 *The Alternative Way of Worship*

The discussions in Jn 4:1–42 deal with subjects as the life-giving water, the status of Jesus, the place of the temple, the way of worshipping and with the ‘harvesting’. John lets the woman, the other Samaritans and Jesus in different ways present their position regarding these features. They represent two groups of people, the ‘Jews’ on the one side and the Samaritans on the other. The significance of the way they represent these two groups is a question that I shall analyse further in chapter 7.

Barrett presents a common view on the relationship of the temple passages in Jn 2 and 4. He argues that the woman presents an outstanding question between ‘Jews’ and Samaritans, that of the rival merits of Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim. In so doing, she reopens the theme of 2:12–22, the new temple body of Jesus, in a wider context, ‘Jesus brings the fulfilment of all the Old Testament offered by way of worship’ (1978:228). In accordance with the temple replacement theory, Barrett takes 4:21 to say that true worship will become possible ‘within the church’ and he connects the statement to the temple cleansing (1978:236). Brown (1966:180) argues that the contrast between worship in geographical temples and worship in ‘spirit and truth’ is ‘part of the familiar Johannine dualism between earthly

and heavenly, ‘from below’ and ‘from above,’ flesh and Spirit’, and that the ‘spirit and truth’ expression just denotes a meaning similar to ‘spirit of truth’. Schnackenburg (1971b:473) argues in a like manner.⁹⁶ Also Beasley-Murray (1987:59) sees a connection to the temple cleansing, and points to the eschatological perspective in 4:23 (ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν) saying that in this way ‘the worship of Jerusalem and Gerizim is declared to be superseded by the worship of the new age introduced by Christ and the Spirit he sends’. Carson (1991:224) argues similarly: ‘This worship can take place only in and through him: he is the true temple (2:19–22), he is the resurrection and the life (11:25).’ The attitude of Jesus in 4:21 towards Jerusalem and Gerizim and the worship there, surely indicates a kind of disparagement of these temples. However, does this attitude mean that the Johannine Christians had abandoned all of the traditional temple institution in principle? My analysis questions this reading and my doubts are well illustrated by the first discussion concerning the common Jewish-Samaritan tradition between Jesus and the Samaritan woman at the well in 4:14ff where Jesus is presented as μείζων τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ. The ‘greater than’-construction does not seem to indicate ideological and social rupture, but redundancy. An analytical conclusion based upon this expression does not legitimate a social practice where the temple as institution was neglected.

The conversation about the well and the water in 4:7–15 may be connected to the discussion of places and modes of worship in 4:16–26 as a matter of relationship between ‘Jews’ and Samaritans generally. In 4:14a, Jesus clearly proclaims that his own water is superior to the water from Jacob’s well (cf. ὅς δ’ ἂν πίη ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὐ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). In this first part of the verse, the understanding the author presents is still related to a literal understanding of ὕδωρ, pointing to its redundant character in a literal way. In the last part, however, the water is transferred to the ‘inner life’ and thus indirectly redefined to a ‘spring of gushing up to eternal life’ (4:14b). Jesus seems here to confirm the question posed by the woman in 4:12 (μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

⁹⁶ ‘Als die ntl. Gottesgemeinde löst sie den alten, heilsgeschichtlich bedingten und begrenzten Kult im Jerusalemer Tempel (V 22) ab durch die neue, auf Christus gegründete Gottesverehrung in Geist und Wahrheit und kennt dabei keinen Unterschied zwischen Juden, Samaritanern und Heiden.’

Ἰακώβ . . .;) and thus indicates that he *is* greater than Jacob. He redefines the water in his own transferred way. Again, this does not mean that the institution 'the well of Jacob' is rejected or abandoned, although it is clearly defined as inferior in one way.

When the Samaritan woman realises that Jesus is a 'prophet' (4:19), John lets her present the Samaritan version of the temple conflict with the 'Jews' in 4:20 (οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ προσεκύνησαν καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ). The future form of προσκυνέω in 4:21 relates both to Gerizim and Jerusalem (πίστενέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί). Barrett (1978:236) argues rightly that we must take the 'you' seriously, Jesus is clearly speaking to the Samaritans. However, this way of speaking also reflects a second level. He argues that John no doubt thinks also of his readers, 'the Christians of his day' (1978:236). The negative equalisation of these two places of cultus may be understood in three ways as seen from the second level of understanding. First, we could read it as an ideological rejection, or secondly, as a statement of the fact that the temples were destroyed, and thirdly, as a real prophecy.⁹⁷ An ideological solution indicates a clear rejection of the temple institution on the part of John.⁹⁸ The main problem with an explicit replacement model that this reading involves, is again that one expects Jesus in the subsequent passages to be presented as one who regarded the traditional temple obsolete in theory as well as in practice. The easiest reading here is, however, to see the prophecy as a reflection of the destruction, without any ideological message.

In 4:22, the 'Jews' are presented as more important than the Samaritans: ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἴδαμεν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν. The statement that the salvation is from the 'Jews' is difficult to place in relation to the historical Jesus. In connection with verses like 4:14, 42 where Jesus is stated to be the saviour, the statements in 4:22 may be interpreted

⁹⁷ Very clearly put forward by Carson (1991) and also recommended by K. Berger (1997:85).

⁹⁸ Cf. 'Rather the point is that with the coming of the 'hour' the distinction between true worshippers and all others turns on factors that make the ancient dispute between the conflicting claims of the Jerusalem temple and Mount Gerizim obsolete' (Carson 1991:224–225).

on the second level as a statement saying that Jesus, qua saviour, was a 'Jew' (see Barrett 1978:237). 4:22 then functions as a transition from the question of the proper place to the question of the proper mode of worship.

The proper mode of worship is clearly presented as a present reality, i.e. a question relevant for the Johannine community. The precise definition of time in the expression καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν in 4:23 is presented in a Johannine comment that puts forward important information of the attitude of John.⁹⁹ The contradictory statement, an example of the 'realised eschatology' in John (Barrett 1978:237), makes the second level commentary evident: the Johannine Christians seem to be the addressees. In 4:21, John does not say that the prophecy had yet been fulfilled, only that the 'time is coming' (ἔρχεται ὥρα). At the same time, in 4:23–24 the worship in 'spirit and truth' is declared to be a possibility already at the time of Jesus (ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν). This must also be taken to mean that every temple-practice of Jesus and the disciples, reflected on the first level of analysis, becomes important for our understanding of the attitudes and relationship of the Johannine Christians to the temple institution as well. The 'spiritual' understanding of worship is projected in the text to the time of Jesus himself. At the same time, John presents Jesus as one who went to the temple to celebrate and worship and who also went to synagogues to teach. At that same time, the ideal worship is looked upon as a worship to be primarily of 'truth and spirit'. This attitude towards traditional temple worship is indeed disinterested, but can hardly be taken as a result of a principle rejection on the part of the community.

The alternative, what προσκυνεῖν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ actually means to John in terms of social practice is, however, not completely clear. The explanation given in 4:24, that πνεῦμα ὁ θεός [ἐστὶν], does not explain this statement fully. As several others, Barrett (1978:238–239) therefore points to Hellenistic parallels to such an idea, particularly by the Stoics and by Philo (for a discussion of the transferred temples of Philo, see chapter 5). There are certainly also some New Testament parallels (Rom 12:1; 2 Cor 3:17; 1 Pet 2:5). Brown (1966:180) argues that it is the spirit given by Jesus that is

⁹⁹ Cf. the same expression in 5:25, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν, and a similar expression is found in 16:32, ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ ἐλήλυθεν.

to animate the worship that replaces worship at the temple, referring to Rom 8:15–16 where the spirit of adoption makes the Christian cry ‘Abba, Father’ and to 3:5 in which John states that one cannot enter the kingdom of God without being born by water and spirit. I think Barrett is right, however, when he claims a more restrictive view concerning the implied social practices included in the expression ‘in spirit and truth’ in 4:21. ‘That true worship is set over against idolatry, and over against a cult restricted to one sanctuary, is not more than incidental’, Barrett argues (1978:239) and is thus in accordance with the above mentioned modified replacement theory by Bultmann. A spiritual understanding may lead to alternative practices, but not necessarily, and the hope for new temple buildings by the author cannot be dismissed on such a ground. Most exegetes also agree that the worship in ‘spirit and truth’ does not contrast internal worship over against external worship (Brown 1966:180), a conclusion that from my point of view further underlines the difficulties with the replacement theory. ‘Redundancy’ is the most striking sociological characterisation of the relationship towards earlier traditions, as it was in connection with the first discussion with the Samaritan woman about the water.

Until now, I have read 4:20–21, 4:22 and 4:23–24 more or less as isolated passages. Read isolated, neither of these passages seems to express a rejection of geographical temples tout court. The question is, however, whether 4:21–22, 23–24 must be seen as related in such a way that they form two parts of the same line of argument, in accordance with the majority of the scholars referred to above. Is the Gospel witness to an attitude saying that ‘since you no longer can worship in Jerusalem or on Mount Gerizim, you can only worship in spirit and truth’ or even saying that ‘since the true worship is spiritual, we do no longer need temporal temple institution and for that reason neglect all its demands’? Seen from the second level of drama analysis, the worship ‘in spirit and truth’ is not a complete rejection statement. In Jn 4:1–42, the worship in two geographical and temporal temples reflects one kind of attitude towards worship while the worship ‘in truth and spirit’ may represent a second alternative, indicating that the traditional Jewish worship now is *passé*. However, whether this attitude reflects a principle and ideological rejection by the Johannine community or only a *modus vivendi* in a situation where the temples were destroyed, is not obvious. The temple statements in Jn 4 would also be understandable

statements in a situation without temples in Jerusalem and Gerizim, and with a community that nevertheless still accepted the temple *institutions* as such.

4.7 A SYNOPSIS OF JN 2 AND 4

I argued that in the temple passage in Jn 2, the temple relationship of Jesus is not explicitly stated by the editor. Both the implicit temple ideology as well as its social consequences on the second level of drama are obscure. Jn 2:13–22 seen isolated, *cannot* be read as a clear example reflecting a total replacement and subsequent rejection and neglect of the temple institution with its sacrificial system and social functions. The similar conclusion is also the most probable in relation to Jn 4. However, the temple statements of Jn 4 may be considered together with the temple sayings in Jn 2 in a general evaluation of the community's temple relationship since there is a general connection of ideas between 2:21 and 4:23.

The temple passage in Jn 2 presents a possible temple 'location', the body of Jesus, but further explanations and any direct or indirect replacing statements are lacking. The temple passage in Jn 4 includes a possible replacing statement but lacks the specifications concerning the place of worship that are necessary to make up a complete replacement logic of reasoning. Together with the declaration in 2:21 about the body of Jesus as a temple, the temple statements of Jn 4 may express that the Johannine community had found an alternative non-physical 'location' for its worship in 'the spirit of truth' (without being a protest against external or socially based worship). If the declaration in 2:21 is understood as a declaration that the body of Jesus is an alternative temple, 4:20–24 gives us reasons to believe that the community also thought it right to neglect traditional temple worship and that the destruction of the temple would not disturb them to any great degree. Seen this way, the analysis supports the temple replacement theory in some sense. Brown, Ådna, Hengel and other scholars with similar replacement theories would be right, then, in assuming that the traditional worship is replaced by a new Christian practice coming to expression in the statements of 4:20–23. The statement declaring that the worshippers were to worship the Father 'in spirit and truth' would be understood as worship in 'the temple of Jesus', a principle legitimating of the neglect

of traditional temple worship and sacrifice, leading to a rejection and complete replacement of the temple institution, but without any rejection of worship in other physical (Christian) forms.

I argued above that the temple relationship indicated by 2:13–22 alone was mirrored by the critical ‘acceptance model’. The destruction saying of Jesus is corrected in the text by John without explicitly indicating the relationship between the two temple entities and without explicitly stating the ontological character of the ‘body temple’, not to mention its further social and practical implications. We have a potential replaced object, a potential replacing subject, but nothing explicitly that links the former to the latter—no explicit replacement statement. In the case of 4:1–42 alone, the probable model seems rather to be either that of ‘acceptance’ or ‘conjunction’ and not ‘rejection’. Seen together, however, these passages may also reflect a ‘rejection model’ that resonates ideas, goals, or even practices once operative in the Johannine community before and after the destruction of the temple. It is difficult to say that there is much hostile antagonism involved as seen from the Gospel of John. In that case, there is a clear and stated difference between the Johannine community and the parent tradition in this matter, perhaps also indicating isolation from this tradition—a typical reaction among new religious movements today, too (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:49). Most of the elements of a complete replacement logic would then seemingly be present when these sections of the Gospel are read together. If the body of Jesus was looked upon as a ‘new temple’ to replace the ‘old temple’, in which a new place for a ‘true’ worship could take place, the replacement theory seems probable at least in one sense with a relatively high degree of tension involved and even rejection. Consequently, both the ‘acceptance’ and ‘conjunction’ model turn out to be less probable responses.

However, several factors speak *against* this conclusion. Metaphorical statements about a body, a community etc. being a temple (Jn 2:21) are too common in Jewish practice and belief in the period to be taken as rejection statements tout court, while Jn 4 only reflects a historical situation without temple buildings and no fundamental rejection, although it could be seen to legitimate a rejection later on. In addition, comparisons with the temple relationship and temple transference described in Philo and Qumran have forced me to *re-draw* the map completely for the understanding of the Johannine community.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE TEMPLE IN PHILO AND QUMRAN

5.1 PHILO AND QUMRAN AS COMPARATIVE SOURCES

The texts of Philo and those from Qumran have the advantage of being relatively more secure historical sources than the Gospel of John in several ways. One major methodological problem with a comparison between the Gospel of John and these other writings, apart from the differences of genre, is the fact that they did not originate at exactly the same period of time and do not describe the same historical events. Nevertheless, they all intersect in one way as they describe fairly similar events and institutions and they all have a kind of Jewish origin. While John and Philo certainly describe events of the first decades in the first century CE, the Qumran community probably refers to incidents more than 100 years before Philo.¹ Now, the Qumran community was probably not dissolved until the Jewish war against the Romans (66–71 CE), and since their texts were apparently in use until then, the writings found at Qumran are of essential interest for the historical study of Philo and the Gospel of John too.² Most probably, the final version of the Gospel of John was written at a time after the Jewish war and when the temple was destroyed, but it reflects both contemporary and former incidents. It is essential for a discussion of the redactional or community level that all of the three groups of writings most probably were *in use* in the second half of the first century. Negatively or positively then, these text-corpora may be looked upon as reflecting

¹ 'Describe' i.e. indirectly, since there are no real history writings among the extant Qumran manuscripts. If we accept the Qumran-Essene connection and the traditional explanation on the origin and history of the scrolls, there were Essenes at Qumran until the Roman war against the Jews. This scholarly consensus that emerged during the years after the discoveries of the scrolls, is largely today still accepted, see e.g. Brooke (1999b:69).

² According to a well-accepted thesis on the Qumran findings. Vermes (1995:xxxiii) argues that the Qumran discoveries are beneficiary particularly for the student of the history of Palestinian Judaism in the period 150 BCE–70 CE. See also the analysis of the Qumran writings below.

practices and beliefs of Judaism(s) in the first century, a fact that further strengthens the historical and sociological value of a comparison.

As stated by several scholars, the significance of Philo for the study of John is not so much the possibility of a direct influence on the early church or the New Testament writers themselves, as in his bearing witness to a particular trend in Jewish milieus as well as Jewish exegesis and life at approximately the same time as the historical Jesus, the object of John's story.³ The attitude of Philo towards the temple is naturally closely linked to his views on other practices and beliefs of Judaism of his time and place, the Mosaic Law in general or in connection with special issues such as Sabbath and circumcision. There is also a connection between the stated attitudes towards the temple and towards the city of Jerusalem, including temple related subjects such as worship, priests, feasts or festivals, and pilgrimage. The statements concerning the temple therefore represent a suggestive part of Philo's attitude to his ancestral traditions generally (see Borgen 1992a). The Philonic corpus covers a broad range of ideas related to the temple that reveal temple attitudes. It also contains several statements concerning social relations like named 'others', and as in the Gospel of John, these statements are often linked to a discussion of places of worship, as will be shown.

It has been broadly discussed whether Philo was a loyal Jew in spite of the influence of Greek language, philosophy and culture in Alexandria (see e.g. Dodd 1953:54). A common opinion today is that he identified not only with 'Athens', but with 'Jerusalem' as well (Borgen 1997:25). A distinction between Jewish and Greek traditions in his writings is very difficult to draw and can only be seen from an analytical point of view. As soon as one starts to discuss particular issues, one seems to find both Jewish and Greek heritage.⁴ Only in an analytical perspective may Philo be looked upon as someone

³ Several scholars have identified common features and concepts between the two collections of writings. Dodd (1953:54ff) stresses that there is a real affinity between the two writers, John and Philo, in their use of symbolism. In his analysis of the use of Philo in the New Testament studies, Runia (1993a:83) points to the fact that the consensus of Johannine scholarship adopts a very cautious approach to the subject of the relation between Philo and John. Borgen (1996a:99) suggests that Philo may 'exemplify Jewish traditions and thought-categories that are interpreted along different lines by him and by John' and this is the method employed in this analysis as well. See also similar discussions in Scott (1995:58); Seland (1995a).

⁴ See Sterling (1998b:188) in his review of Borgen (1997).

who represents attitudes of a typical Diaspora Jew loyal to the temple and related issues in a fundamental way; in addition, he may be viewed as someone representing the Jewish fascination for Greek philosophy.

In any case, the analyses of his mixed positions based upon statements in his writings may serve as a suitable perspective for a comparison of statements found in the Gospel of John and the social characteristics presumably also typical for the members of the Johannine community.

The temple orientation in the Qumran literature seemed to be evident in the first jars and scrolls found near the ruins of Qumran. It represents an orientation that was naturally recognised and studied in the Qumran scholarship at the early stage.⁵ Gärtner (1965:22) for example, described the broken connection between the alleged community at Qumran and the temple at Jerusalem (cf. Klinzing 1971:91 and Fiorenza 1976). Today, after the Qumran scholarship has matured and the extant manuscripts have been published, it is possible to reassess the primary conclusions about this relationship (cf. Stegemann 1992b:122–126). Earlier, it was argued that the Qumran community opposed the institution of the temple tax (Liver 1963), a practice that would clearly demonstrate their general opposition to the authorities in Jerusalem. This is not any longer seen as evident. Baumgarten argues that the Qumran members had been engaged in a debate concerning whether the daily sacrifice in the temple should be paid for by public funds or not (Baumgarten 1995:21). In that case, also the Qumran community was deeply concerned about the temple, negatively or positively. Even opposition demonstrates involvement and I shall add some arguments in this discussion of the status of the community in relation to the temple and the general society below.

5.2 THE TEMPLE IN PHILO'S WRITINGS

Since my focal point is the statements concerning the temple, I have scrutinised Philo passages referring to the Jerusalem temple, other temples and temple related issues and studied the possible attitude

⁵ For a description of the history of the scholarly research on Qumran and the New Testament, see Brooke (1999b).

of Philo towards these issues in a search for structural similarities with the Gospel of John. I am asking if and how the attitudes, beliefs, and practices of Alexandrian Jews like Philo also may influence our understanding of the Johannine community.

This means that other relevant and related issues in Philo shall not be focused on. I am referring to issues such as the origin of Philo's doctrines in Jewish and/or Greek education, the Jewish exegetical traditions before him, his cosmological conceptions in general, his doctrine of man, his mysticism, political theories, later influence on Christian writers etc.⁶ His many and specific statements on the sacrifices are also less significant for my study. Bringing in an analysis of his attitude towards sacrifices generally would include discussions not mandatory for my overall discussion.⁷ Main scholarly positions regarding Philo's general attitude towards the Law and towards ancestral customs have been presented in chapter 3, where I have supported the theories saying that Philo stood in a middle position between traditional and non-traditional views on these matters. In this chapter, I shall study if and how this general pattern may be identified when it comes to the question of temple adherence.

5.2.1 *Was the Temple Interesting for Philo?*

It has been argued by scholars that Philo's conception of the temple is disinterested, even un-Jewish. Bréhier (1925:227) compares the situation of the Jewish 'colony' in Egypt with the situation of the Jews in exile in Babylon after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BCE as described in Isaiah: 'le culte n'étant pas fixé dans sa rigueur permettait un libre développement de la piété intérieure.' Even if this

⁶ For a general introduction to Philo and to my topic, see for instance Goodenough (1962), Sandmel (1984), and the contributions in the volume of 'Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt' on Philo (Haase 1984), as well as Borgen (1992a; 1992b; 1992c; 1997).

The conceptions of Philo regarding the temple are discussed particularly by Bréhier (1925), Heinemann (1962:16ff), and Früchtel (1968:69ff). Runia (1986b) discusses the origins of the cosmological and anthropological conceptions of Philo in Plato. Dahl (1963) and McKelvey (1969) have studied the background in Philo for the New Testament conception of 'church' among other subjects. Seland (1995a) examines temple related issues in connection with a discussion of 'common' or 'holy priesthood' in Philo and 1 Peter.

⁷ See for instance the discussion in Wolfson (1962:241ff) and Williamson (1970:164) of whether prayer had replaced sacrifices.

did not convey them to a neglect of the cultus, it was inevitable that the moral aspect became more important than the cultic aspects, he argues ('le côté moral du culte l'emportât'). Heinemann (1962:16ff) argues that Philo finds the sacrifices in Jerusalem valid because they fill the universal function in men's need of piety: 'die Opfergesetze finden ihre Rechtfertigung im 'frommen Drang' der Menschen' (1962:79). He points out that even if this functionalist idea of a need of piety and the ideas about the cosmos and soul as temples reflect a typical Greek way of thinking, it is also part of a common universal tendency in the period since Philo, in his doctrine of sacrifice, expresses Jewish forms (content) using Greek terms.⁸ Heinemann's way of arguing about the relationship of Judaism and Hellenistic ideas and practices demonstrates the belief in a sharp distinction between Palestinian Judaism, as reflected in rabbinical writings, and Hellenistic Judaism, as reflected in Philo. Since this distinction concerning the relationship between Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism has become dubious (Hengel 1974a; 1974b; Borgen 1984b:153; N. Cohen 1995), one should reconsider other relevant aspects of Philo in relation to the New Testament as well.

Similarly, Früchtel (1968) contends that Philo was not interested in the Jerusalem temple. Her discussions concern primarily the cosmological conceptions in Philo in which the temple is a part of the overall discussion. She compares the two traditions on the temple found in Spec. 1:66ff (cosmos as temple) and Mos. 2:67ff (the tabernacle as a copy of the heavenly temple) and concludes that these are the two main cosmological temple traditions. It seems to be the mere existence of these two traditions that leads her to the analytical conclusion that the temple was *uninteresting* for Philo (Früchtel 1968:81, n. 2):

Indirekt lässt sich aus der Art und Weise, wie Philo die beiden grossen Traditionen über den Tempel weiterüberliefert, erschliessen, was er vom Jerusalemer Heiligtum hält: Es ist ganz uninteressant.

Mendelson (1988:18ff) also underscores Philo's apparent lack of interest in some passages concerning the temple, pilgrimage and temple offerings. One should, for instance, expect comments on Alexandrian

⁸ '... seine Opferlehre jüdische Form in griechischer Formel ausspricht' (Heinemann 1962:79).

pilgrimage to Jerusalem in connection with his commentary on Deut 16:16 that prescribes the pilgrimage (Leg. 3:11). This and similar observations, such as his allegorical understanding of 'sacred places' (see Leg. 1:62), make Mendelson argue that Philo was caught between two worlds, an 'idealistic allegiance to tradition and a realistic accommodation to the exigencies of life' (Mendelson 1988:21). As a member of a religious minority, the Alexandrian Jews had to accommodate (1988:28). From my point of view, one should *not*, however, take this lack of interest as bearing witness to a fundamental attitude towards the temple institution. Mendelson also sees Philo's fidelity to ancestral custom, but his reduction of the relevance of Philo's own trip to Jerusalem is unbalanced.

The question of Philo's attitudes and relations to the Jerusalem temple has implications for the question of his particularism and universalism, a much-discussed issue in Philonic scholarship. Segal (1986:163ff) has convincingly demonstrated the problems with the terms and urges one to differentiate between a Jewish and a Christian understanding. I want to look at this problem from a social scientific point of view asking in what direction Philo encourages his fellow Alexandrian Jews in relation to the question of temple worship and in relation to his general social attitude towards 'others'. In my chapter 8, I am evaluating Philo's view on Israel as priesthood for the world in this regard.⁹ A similar question is phrased in the aforementioned problem of his identity: Greek or Jew, Philo Judaeus or Philo Alexandrinus or perhaps both?¹⁰ Philo's attitude towards the

⁹ Borgen (1984b:113) points to the fact that this question has dominated much of the research on Philo, see Goodenough (1962:80, 132); Mendelson (1988); Heinemann (1962), Sandmel (1971; 1979). The discussion is dependent on the definitions of these terms. A combination of the notions seems to be a good way to phrase Philo's ambivalence, but again we must then ask whether Philo was a 'universal particularist' (a particularist who in one way opened Judaism to all men), a 'particularistic universalist' (a universalist who believed that Judaism was the best, but not the exclusive expression of how humanity understands the divine), or someone who was a universalist in intellectual views but a particularist in social practices and who never resolved the tension between the two. See my discussions in chapter 8 and in Segal (1986:163ff); Birnbaum (1996:3ff, 224ff); Borgen (1992b:135; 1992d:345); Sterling (1998a:194).

¹⁰ Cf. my presentation of Philo in chapter 3. An either-or judgement again seems difficult. See also the headings and discussions in Nikiprowetzky (1977:11ff, 40ff). Sandmel (1984:31ff) says that 'the Jew Philo is a Greek' thus concluding that Philo is an example of a unique blend. Politically, Philo had two foci, Rome and Alexandria as seen in his historical treatises.

temple is naturally closely linked to his view of all Jewish practices and beliefs of his days, the Mosaic Law and his ancestral traditions or the 'national philosophy'.¹¹ The role of the Jerusalem temple in Philo may be drawn in as part of this discussion, but I will not use these external and modern terms as a starting point of my discussion.

Goodenough (1969) argues similarly to Heinemann and Früchtel on Philo's temple attitude, saying that Philo represents a thoroughly paganised Judaism with a mystic gospel, a Hellenism presented in Jewish symbols and allegories, but 'still a Hellenistic dream of the solution of the problem of life by ascent higher and even higher in the Streaming light-Life of God' (1969:263–264). He also argues that the legalism of Philo 'was not the legalism of 'normative' Judaism', referring particularly to Pharisees and Sadducees and to rabbinism that lacks Philo's quest for mystical metaphysics (1969:83–85). Goodenough (1962) nevertheless observes that Philo was a patriotic Jew, but when it came to the temple cultus, Philo made it into a cosmic mystery and Goodenough concludes: 'One cannot read the material Philo has on this subject without the sense that to him the temple service was almost literally mystic ritual' (1962:157).¹²

On the other side, there are scholars who conclude that Philo supported the temple in principle. Borgen (1984b:115) argues that Philo accepted the jurisdiction of the Jerusalem temple. Williamson (1970:164), who has compared temple issues such as the one prevalent in my investigation in a comparison between Philo's writings and the Letter to the Hebrews, argues rightly that the statements of Agrippa in front of Gaius Caligula in Legat. 306 does not reflect the words of one who completely rejected the practice of sacrifice.

There are also several passages in Philo's writings that directly contradict the impression of a disinterest in the Jerusalem temple cultus and that indicate a positive attitude towards the Jerusalem temple and the sacrificial system. There are more than 100 references

¹¹ Philo's own expression, ἡ πάτριος φιλοσοφία (Legat. 156). Instead of 'national', one should perhaps use 'ancestral' today.

¹² See also Goodenough (1962:80), cf. the comments in Borgen (1984b:140). K.-W. Niebuhr (1999) compares the Torah-reception of Paul and James with the early Jewish communities, including Philo, and sees these attempts as part of common diaspora efforts to fulfil the regulations of the law (1999:430ff).

to words like ναός,¹³ οἶκος θεοῦ,¹⁴ νεωκόρος,¹⁵ νεωκορία¹⁶ and ἱερεύω.¹⁷ Ἰερὸν is employed in 21 of the around 44 extant Greek writings of Philo, indicating the centrality of the notion.¹⁸ In addition, his works include references to other temple related subjects.¹⁹ We find a whole range of references both to geographical sites, spiritualised or transferred issues and allegorical interpretation of the temple and other temple-related issues. The references to the tabernacle (σκηνή) are also numerous.²⁰ We find passages discussing questions in connection with practices of the Sabbath and the circumcision, but also questions like the status of the city of Jerusalem. Together with indirect references, they cover a broad range of ideas of and attitudes to the temple and temple related issues—issues more or less unexplored in a systematic and comparative way by New Testament scholars. Interesting is also the fact that there was a Jewish-Egyptian temple that he does not mention at all: the Onias temple in Leontopolis.²¹

Philo's many references to the temple in Jerusalem indicate at least his and his fellow Jewish Diaspora-Alexandrians' feeling of a

¹³ Ναός, 32 times in Opif. 137; Cher. 100; Det. 20; Ebr. 85; Somn. 2:246; Mos. 2:72, 89, 138, 178, 276; Decal. 7; Spec. 1:21, 66, 72, 123, 268, 270, 274; 3:89; Virt. 188; Flacc. 46, 92; Legat. 139, 150, 151, 191, 278, 292, 295, 319, 346; Hypoth. 6:6.

¹⁴ Οἶκος θεοῦ in Cher. 52; Sacr. 72; Post. 5; Plant. 50; Migr. 5; Somn. 1:85; 2:272; Praem. 123.

¹⁵ Νεωκορία in Somn. 2:272.

¹⁶ Νεωκόρος, 17 times in Fug. 90, 93, 94; Mos. 1:316, 318, 318; 2:72, 159, 174, 174, 276, 276; Spec. 1:156, 156; 2:120; Praem. 74; QG isf 17.

¹⁷ Ἱερεύω, 7 times in Abr. 233; Mos. 1:277, 309; Praem. 139; Prob. 89; Legat. 62, 233.

¹⁸ The noun 'temple', not forms of the adjective 'holy'. See Borgen, Fuglseth and Skarsten (2000:ad loc.)—the passages are too numerous to be listed here.

¹⁹ I have not studied Philo's relationship to festivals or feasts as such. Temple festivals were naturally of less importance for Diaspora Jews, and perhaps Mos. 2:232 can be seen as Philo's own defence for their practice, connected to the dispensation in Num 9:6–13. Philo often stresses the spiritual state of the worshipper to the expense of the offering, see Mos. 2:107–108; Plant. 108. Mendelson (1988:62ff) comments on these passages and argues that the Day of Atonement (see Mos. 2:23; Spec. 2:194) was part of the lowest common denominator of traditional commitment since Philo expected all Alexandrian Jews to participate, even 'those who never act religiously in the rest of their life' (Spec. 1:186).

²⁰ See e.g. Leg. 2:54; 3:46, 95; Det. 63, 160; Gig. 54; Ebr. 127; Migr. 202; Her. 112; Congr. 89; Fug. 186; Mut. 43, 190; Mos. 1:317; 2:74, 141; Spec. 2:41, 204.

²¹ Spec. 1:67 mentions a temple 'made by hands' (τὸ χειρόκμητον definite form singular), an expression that Goodenough (1969:108, n. 56) thinks alludes to the Onias temple, but the Jerusalem temple is most likely the address here. Temple criticism was after all not uncommon. On Spec. 1:66ff, see below.

close relationship to Palestinian Judaism, particularly to the temple. He describes how he himself made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Prov. 2:64),²² with a description of the journey indicating that he himself in fact visited the temple.²³ He describes how other Alexandrians went on pilgrimage offering sacrifices and their religious zeal while doing so.²⁴ In addition, in Legat. 155–156 he describes how the Jewish Romans follow the same pattern, how they collect the temple tax and send them by envoy to Jerusalem and the temple. Inferring from these observations alone, the temple seems to have been socially important not only for Philo and his fellow Alexandrian Jews but for other Diaspora Jews as well. For Philo, it was more than a starting point for mystical speculation.

Against this background, I think it is fair to ask if judgements like that of Früchtel, claiming that the temple was ‘uninteresting’ for Philo, really show proper appreciation of Philo’s overall attitude towards temple Judaism?²⁵ There are passages in the Philonic corpus indicating that Philo was interested in the fate of the Jerusalem temple, and these passages have to be considered in an overall evaluation of attitudes and practices concerning the temple. Particularly interesting passages in this connection are Spec. 1:67 (on the need of a place for piety) and Migr. 89–93 (warning against abrogation of the Law). In order to limit the scope of the investigation to within reasonable size, only the relationship to the temple in Jerusalem and some related sacrificial issues will be discussed in detail.²⁶ I shall

²² ‘There is a city on the sea coast of Syria called Ascalon. While I was there at a time when I was on my way to our ancestral temple to offer up prayers and sacrifices, I observed a large number of pigeons at the cross roads and in each house . . .’ (Prov. 2:64). The expression καθ’ ὃν χρόνον (‘at that time’) does not indicate whether he made one or several journeys to Jerusalem. The Philonic authenticity of this fragment from Eusebius Praeparatio Evangelica 8:14 is reasonably certain, see the discussion in Hadas-Lebel (1973:36); Colson (1941:447ff).

²³ As Heinemann (1962:16–17) argues ‘mit ziemlicher Sicherheit’ and ‘sicher aus persönlicher Erfahrung’, although he also observes that Philo does not always make it clear if he is aware of the differences between the biblical prescriptions and the Herodian temple—at least if we compare his information to the later Mishnah and other later Jewish writings.

²⁴ See the description of the pilgrimage in Spec. 1:68b–69. The zeal in combination with other feasts celebrated in Alexandria is described, for example, in Spec. 1:186 in connection with Yom Kippur in ‘the feast of trumpets’, where even those who did nothing pious at other times are described as taking part in this ζήλος.

²⁵ See also Borgen (1984b:115) who describes the conclusion of Früchtel as ‘a very superficial and mistaken approach to Philo’s thinking’.

²⁶ See the range of possible issues to be discussed in Heinemann (1962:17ff).

argue that these issues suffice to demonstrate the fruitfulness of Philo's writings in my background analyses of the Gospel of John.

As will be shown, Philo's references to the notion 'temple' may be divided into three groups similar to the structure of the temple references in John (p. 123):

1. References to the geographical or temporal temple (Jerusalem and her temple, temple buildings).
2. References to functions of the temple, sacrifice, and worship.
3. References to a transferred temple (soul and mind as temples, and cosmos as temple) and transferred temple related issues.

Interestingly too, the fourth category is missing, i.e. the *new* temple, although there are some allusions to the restoration of Israel and its cities, see Praem. 94–97; 168.²⁷ These allusions are hardly evidence enough to say that he did not care for the existing temple. On the contrary, it is tempting to interpret this lack of reference to a kind of eschatological temple as support of the existing one, particularly in light of the evidence for his final endorsement of a literal understanding of the Law and ancestral tradition (cf. chapter 3).

5.2.2 *Jerusalem and the Temple*

5.2.2.1 *Struggle for the Jerusalem Temple*

The central position of Jerusalem for Philo is indicated by characteristics such as πατρίς, μητρόπολις and ιερόπολις.²⁸ In Legat. 281, Philo speaks of Jerusalem in laudable terms:

περὶ δὲ τῆς ἱεροπόλεως τὰ προσήκοντά μοι λεκτέον· αὕτη, καθάπερ ἔφην, ἐμὴ μὲν ἐστὶ πατρίς, μητρόπολις δὲ οὐ μιᾶς χώρας Ἰουδαίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν πλείστων, διὰ τὰς ἀποικίας ἃς ἐξέπεμψεν ἐπὶ καιρῶν εἰς μὲν τὰς ὁμόρους, Αἴγυπτον, Φοινίκην κτλ.²⁹

²⁷ See E. P. Sanders (1985:86) and Borgen (1992d).

²⁸ Μητρόπολις is found in Conf. 78; Fug. 94; Somn. 1:41, 181; Flacc. 46; Legat. 203, 281, 294, 305, 334; ιερόπολις is found in Mos. 2:72; Spec. 3:53, 130; Flacc. 46; Legat. 225, 282, 288, 299, 346.

²⁹ 'As for the holy city, I must say what befits me to say. While she, as I have said, is my native city she is also the mother city not of one country Judaea but of most of the others in virtue of the colonies sent out at divers times to the neighbouring lands Egypt, Phoenicia etc.' (Legat. 281).

The context refers to the conflict of Jews with the Roman emperor Gaius Caligula who wanted to raise a statue of himself as Zeus in the inner sanctuary of the Jerusalem temple (Legat. 188, cf. Josephus Antiq. 18:261). Even if this conflict was not the reason for the Alexandrian delegation to go to Rome, Philo says that he and other members of the delegation, actually staying in the capital at the time when the decree was declared, reacted spontaneously against it (Legat. 189–190). They were ‘speechless’ (ἄχανεῖς) and wanted to struggle for the temple, a reaction I think very well demonstrates his general attitude towards temple Judaism. As leader of the delegation to the emperor, Philo includes himself among those who were speechless. This reconstruction of Agrippa’s letter to Gaius is naturally biased as Philo combines the struggle for rights of the Jewish Alexandrians with the situation in Jerusalem,³⁰ but Philo reacts similarly to other Jews known from Josephus (cf. above). Here the writing reflects Philo’s willingness to defend the temple during the incident, and describes his fellow-Jews in Alexandria in like manner. If necessary they were indeed willing to die ‘not once but a thousand times’ for the sanctuary (Legat. 209).³¹

The cited passage from Legat. 281 indicates not only that he looks upon Jerusalem as a home town, but also that he explains the relationship between Jerusalem and all the Diaspora Jewish settlements generally as a relationship between a mother city, μητρόπολις, and her colonies (ἀποικίαι), quite in accordance with the classical precedent of the model (see Niehoff 2002). In this way, he demonstrates a kind of cosmopolitan concept of a Jewish commonwealth despite the obvious differences between the Greek colonisation and the Jewish one (the Jews were not conquerors) and despite Roman control at the time making the metaphor somewhat strained (Amir 1983:52–53). Anyway, Philo is stating a double loyalty here; Jerusalem with her temple is both home city (metropolis) and holy city, i.e. both a

³⁰ Williamson (1989:12) argues that viewpoints of Agrippa reflect the Jewish viewpoints generally, often paralleled and shared by Philo in other writings.

³¹ Mendelson (1988:17, 74) refers to Deus 17–18 to argue that a Jew, according to Philo, should be prepared to die to defend the temple. Deus 16–19 is a diatribe against egoists symbolised by Onan (Gen 38:9). Although holy cultus (rites) and piety are mentioned (ιερώων ἁγιστεία and ἡ πρὸς θεὸν εὐσέβεια), the temple in Jerusalem is not. The passage nevertheless functions as a background to the more specific statements concerning the temple in Legat. 209.

religious and a political centre.³² Amir analyses particularly the meaning of the pilgrimage for Philo and detects several Stoic features, such as the significance of testing or affliction and ‘internal’ attitude when sacrificing, the description of the temple as a ‘port’ (ὑπόδρομος) and a place at which one may find ‘calm weather’ (εὐδία, see Spec. 1:68–69). He argues that Philo looked upon Jerusalem in the same way as the inhabitants of Greek colonies looked upon their mother city. As the years passed by, the only connection with the mother city they came to have was the cultus and the religious system. He argues that Philo needs the distance to the temple in his everyday religious life since it demonstrates the necessary testing known to us from the Stoics (Amir 1983:63). My point does not concern the significance of Jerusalem for Philo’s religious life in the city of Alexandria, only the fact that he does not reject the temple ordinances and for that reason, he and his fellow Jewish Alexandrians must be considered to be temple adherents. Whether the meaning for him in his everyday life (‘Alltagsleben’) was Stoic-like in the manner Amir thinks, is difficult to tell from these passages alone. Amir argues that the main point for Philo is a ‘pilgrimage to a foreign country’ seen in the use of ξενιτεύω in Spec. 1:68, a word that means ‘going to a foreign place’ and that Jerusalem is not the main issue at stake. However, as Amir (1983:57) admits, the section presents an ambiguous attitude (‘Doppelheit’) concerning the importance of Jerusalem.

In Mos. 2:232, Philo gives a quite practical reason for the fact that Diaspora Jews did not travel to Jerusalem on every prescribed occasion. Moses had accepted some exceptions according to Num 9:9ff, and Philo finds it natural that ‘settlers abroad’ fall into a similar category.³³

³² See also Mos. 1:234; Legat. 214, 281–283; Flacc. 45–46. Despite his conscious statements concerning the Jewish Diaspora, and his concern for the Jewish political situation in Alexandria, the focus of his attention was Jerusalem, cf. Praem. 165 and the observations in Amir (1983:52–64) and Mendelson (1988:17).

³³ ‘The same permission also must be given to those who are prevented from joining the whole nation in worship not by mourning but by absence in a distant country. For settlers abroad and inhabitants of other regions are not wrongdoers who deserve to be deprived of equal privileges etc.’ (Mos. 2:232).

5.2.2.2 *Temple Tax*

The Alexandrian Jews regularly went to Jerusalem to visit and sacrifice in the temple there. As stated, Philo has many references to the temple of Jerusalem showing his and his fellow Jewish Diaspora-Alexandrians' close relationship to Palestine, to the temple in Jerusalem and, accordingly, to temple Judaism. Important is their economical support of the temple in Jerusalem, through the paying of the temple tax, τὰ λύτρα. Philo describes in Legat. 156 how the Alexandrians collected money of the first fruit and sent these as offerings to the temple in Jerusalem: ἡπίστατο καὶ χρήματα συνάγοντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν ἱερὰ καὶ πέμποντας εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα διὰ τῶν τὰς θυσίας ἀναξόντων.³⁴

In Spec. 1:76–78, he describes how the ransom money or half-shekels were being collected throughout the year and sent to Jerusalem at 'stated times', to fulfil the Law.³⁵ The practice is derived from the prescription in Exod 30:11–16, but seems to refer to a historical practice by the Alexandrians since Philo himself distinguishes between scriptural prescription and actual practice. At the end of Spec. 1:78, he again refers to the fact that the temple tax (first-fruits) is prescribed by the Law, cf. ἐν γὰρ ταῖς νομίμοις ἀπαρχαῖς αἱ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἐλπίδες εἰσίν. In Legat. 156, 216 and 312, Philo states that the Alexandrians were allowed to go to Jerusalem (cf. the similar reports in Josephus Antiq. 18:310–313). There are also some Roman manuscripts demonstrating that the Jews were allowed to do this, at least before the common era (Smallwood 1970:238–239). There can be little doubt that the mentioning of the tax payment in Philo and Josephus reflects an actual practice where the local Jewish communities in the Diaspora sent selected envoys. There can also be little doubt that Philo himself had been a member of such an envoy in connection with his own pilgrimage to Jerusalem (Prov. 2:64). The role of this temple worship is underlined here by the

³⁴ 'He [Gaius] knew too that they collect money for sacred purposes from their first-fruits and send them to Jerusalem by persons who would offer the sacrifices' (Legat. 156).

³⁵ 'For it is ordained that everyone, beginning at his twentieth year, should make an annual contribution of first-fruits. These contributions are called 'ransom money', and therefore the first-fruits are given with the utmost zeal. The donors bring them cheerfully and gladly, expecting that the payment will give them release from slavery or healing of diseases and the enjoyment of liberty fully secured and also complete preservation from danger' (Spec. 1:77).

reasons for people paying the money as an offer ‘with the utmost zeal’ and ‘cheerfully and gladly’, they expect that this payment (ἡ κατάθεσις) will give them liberty in several ways. An allegorical understanding of λύτρωα in Her. 182 similarly refers to freedom from ‘passions and wrongdoings’, but he also refers to the notion in a non-allegorical way.

The paying of the temple tax most clearly shows that Philo describes these Alexandrian Jews not only as being under Jerusalem *jurisdiction*, but also as *temple oriented*, basing their practice on prescriptions in the Law. They sacrificed at the temple in Jerusalem as much as their Diaspora situation allowed, and in a practical and concrete manner, they supported the temple financially. Although this was perhaps expected of them, they nevertheless meet these expectations.

5.2.2.3 *Temple Buildings*

The admiration of the tabernacle construction and equipment as described in Exod 25–26 is profound in Philo’s writings. In Ebr. 85, Philo interprets these prescriptions that not only the outside of the ark but *also* the inside should be covered with gold (in Exod 25:10 and elsewhere). He argues that these prescriptions are to be symbols of ideal virtues, saying that both the invisible virtues of the soul as well as the visible virtues are important. This admiration may also be observed vis-à-vis the Herodian temple. In Spec. 1:71ff, Philo describes these temple buildings. The inner centre is said to be beautiful beyond all possible description (cf. κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσαίτατον αὐτὸς ὁ νεὸς παντὸς λόγου κρείττων, Spec. 1:72). In Legat. 198, he describes the entire temple site of the Herodian temple as the most beautiful (cf. κατήχεται δέ, ὅτι καὶ πάντων ἱερῶν τῶν πανταχοῦ κάλλιστόν ἐστιν).

Does the Jerusalem temple have any other advantages to other temples, in addition to its beauty and symbolic power? In general, Philo is not favourably inclined to Gentile temples or Gentile cultus and at several places he offers sharp criticism of Gentile temples and cultus. In Spec. 1:21ff, he heavily attacks those who fashion gods in gold and silver and he banishes mystery religion (Spec. 1:319ff).³⁶ Nevertheless, in Cher. 94 he speaks of Gentile temples as ‘the most holy temples’,³⁷ and of the service here as the ‘service of God’ (θερ-

³⁶ See the study of Wolfson (1962:27ff) on Philo’s relationship to gods, myths, and mysteries generally.

³⁷ Ἐπειδὴν δὲ ὡς περ χειμάρρου φορὰ πάντη νεμηθεῖσα καὶ ἱερῶν τοῖς ἀγιωτά-

απεία θεοῦ), but he is primarily attacking the insult of impious behaviour here rather than actually evaluating the temple and the service of God as such. In Decal. 76, he is also attacking the Egyptians that worship animals. All in all, he does not seem largely favourable to these kinds of Gentile worship.

5.2.3 *Transferred Temple and Related Issues*

5.2.3.1 *The Genuine Sacrifice and Universal Temple*

There is perhaps a slight difference of attitude towards Gentile worship in Plant. 126 with its combination of the question of buildings with the question of sacrifice, particularly seen in the expression θεῷ δὲ οὐκ ἔνεστι γνησίως εὐχαριστῆσαι δι' ὧν νομίζουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ κατασκευῶν ἀναθημάτων θυσίων.³⁸ This Philo writing (De Plantatione) is an exegetical commentary on Noah and the act of planting that takes Gen 9:20 as its starting point. From §73 Philo presents what he looks upon as lessons to be learnt from Noah, the first planter. Plant. 126 is part of an exposition of Lev 19:23–25 concerning rules of cleansing and times of harvesting the fruit. The exposition runs from §93 (94) to §139 in which the idea of the (cleansing and) progress of a pupil is important. In §§117–139, Lev 19:24 ('In the fourth year all their fruit shall be set apart for rejoicing in the Lord') is interpreted. In §§117–125 he presents ideas on the number 4 (relating to the rules concerning the fourth year of the planting or pruning). Central notions from Lev 19:24 like κάρπος, ἅγιος, αἰνετός and κύριος

τοῖς προσπελάσασα βιάσεται κτλ. ('But when their wickedness like a rushing torrent spreads over every place and invades and violates the most sacred temples, etc.' Cher. 94). He may refer only to what is sacred to these persons without virtue and not what is sacred to him, Philo. In the first sentence in that same paragraph, he states that 'Such are the feasts of those whom men call happy' (τοιαῦται τῶν λεγομένων εὐδαιμόνων αἱ ἑορταί) thus introducing the referential perspective; the men are not happy, they are called happy. Similarly, he may think of what is sacred, i.e. temples for them, an understanding that reduces the impression that Philo himself regards these temples sacred.

³⁸ Θεῷ δὲ οὐκ ἔνεστι γνησίως εὐχαριστῆσαι δι' ὧν νομίζουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ κατασκευῶν ἀναθημάτων θυσίων—οὐδὲ γὰρ σύμπας ὁ κόσμος ἱερὸν ἀξιόχρεον ἂν γένοιτο πρὸς τὴν τούτου τιμὴν—, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐπαίνων καὶ ὕμνων κτλ. 'But it is not possible genuinely to express our gratitude to God by means of buildings and oblations and sacrifices, as is the custom of most people, for even the whole world were not a temple adequate to yield the honour due to Him. Nay, it must be expressed by means of hymns of praise etc.' (Plant. 126). See Heinemann (1962:46) and Williamson (1970:166–168; 173–174).

are taken up in the subsequent understanding of the scripture by Philo in §§126–127 with variants such as ἔπαινοι, θεός and ὁ ποιητής. In §126, Philo thus explains the meaning of the word ‘of praise’ or more exactly, why the scripture not only defines the fruit to be ‘holy’ (ἅγιος), but also ‘for praise’ (αἰνετός). He connects praise to thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) and thanksgiving is connected to the praise that is not seen or heard. The ultimate hymn (ὕμνος) is consequently explained *not* to be the hymn of loud voices, but of the invisible and most pure mind (ὁ ἀειδὴς καὶ καθαρώτατος νοῦς).

The word γνησίως is essential for the understanding of the passage. It not only means ‘genuinely’, but also has alternatives like ‘belonging to the race’, a meaning also indicated in the expression ‘our gratitude’.³⁹ Anyway, the text indicates that Philo juxtaposes two sorts of sacrifice (genuine and not genuine). In this passage, he seems to compare the audible praise to the function of temple buildings generally (plural of κατασκευή), i.e. not only of the temple buildings in Jerusalem. The first part of the cited statement, regarding the fact that even the cosmos is not an adequate temple, alludes to scriptural traditions.⁴⁰ The second part of the statement, regarding the hymns of praise, also has direct Old Testament/Tanak parallels. Criticism of the sacrificial system is found in the prophetic writings as well (Amos 5:21–25; Hos 6:6; Isa 1:11–15; Jer 7:21ff).⁴¹

In contrast to Philo, these texts refer to only one temple, while Philo’s statement seems to place all temples everywhere (with offerings and sacrifices) into one and the same category. In the cited passage of Plant. 126, he includes in the remark on physical or actual worship a criticism on the offerings in the Jerusalem temple buildings as well. The expression σύμπας ὁ κόσμος may therefore take one step further on the line to universalism compared to the cited Old Testament/Tanak statements and Luke’s report of Stephen in Acts

³⁹ The word γένος may be translated with ‘race’ (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940:354). ‘Our gratitude’ cf. the translation in Philo (1929–1953).

⁴⁰ We find similar attitudes in Isa 66:1; 1 Kgs 8:27–29; 2 Chr 2:6. It is also similar to the statements of Stephen in Acts 7:48ff citing Isa 66:1ff.

⁴¹ See Williamson (1970:162) who also discusses the parallels in Qumran writings. The same conception of the cosmos as temple we also find in Stoic doctrines. For a discussion of the Stoic background, see McKelvey (1969:30–40); Schrenk (1965); Wolfson (1962:200ff).

7. The expression included temple buildings everywhere, while the other statements are Jerusalem-centred.

Similarly, Det. 21 speaks of the genuine worship that it is that of a soul bringing simple truth as its only sacrifice, cf. γνήσιοι [θεραπείαι] δ' εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχῆς ψιλὴν καὶ μόνην θυσίαν φερούσης ἀλήθειαν. In the same paragraph, Philo also blames those who think piety is a ritual (θρησκεία) instead of holiness (ὁσιότης). Among the examples we find in the preceding paragraph the man who builds a temple νεὼν ἰδρύεται, i.e. a general description of Gentile cultus (if not included a criticism of the Onias temple).

5.2.3.2 *Allegorical Exegesis and Temple Relationship*

The above observations demonstrate that Philo presents partly contradictory statements regarding physical temples and sacrifice. On the one side, we have passages that bear witness to a deeply temple-related community in the city of Alexandria that is tied to the Jerusalem temple. On the other side we have texts declaring Philo's view on the temple that seem to reduce the regard of the physical temple buildings both in Jerusalem and elsewhere, including such items as actual hymns of praise, by explicitly claiming that what is indeed important is to seek the *ultimate* meaning of the temples and the *ultimate* praise. One of the main tasks below is to see if and how these ideas are related to the institution 'the Jerusalem temple' in a wider sense.

There is a connection between an allegorical understanding of the sacred texts and the understanding of transferred temples and temple related issues in Philo, a connection that is valuable in a sociological analysis. Several times, but not always, Philo states that a transference of a visible phenomenon has become abundantly necessary for him in order to understand what he thinks is an absurd statement in the scripture when reading the text literally (e.g. Somn. 2:250, see below). The allegorical method of Philo has been particularly discussed by Früchtel (1968) and I. Christiansen (1969) from a Platonic point of view. I. Christiansen argues that Philo has applied the dialectical method of dieresis (division) as basis for the allegorical exegesis. Philo builds up a pyramid system of concepts from the specific to the general or most universal categories. The general ideas were originally divided into parts the whole way down to the empirical phenomena. In the Mosaic Law, these ideas are revealed and

have to be recognised and through analogy the interpreter defines the more general idea.

This dialectic method is further based on a dualistic Platonic philosophy or epistemology. The empirical world has an inferior ontological status to the noetic world or the world of ideas; there is ontological dualism between the empirical and ideal world. The general concepts are more real than the empirical phenomena because they are more intelligible (Jones 1970:130). These empirical phenomena have to be transcended and their true meaning disclosed. The utmost true meaning of a phenomenon finds its place at the top of this ontological pyramid. The aim of the allegorical (dieretic) method is to find the unity of all beings (I. Christiansen 1969:42, 44). This interpretation of symbols plays a central part in the allegorical technique. In a symbol two concepts participate in the one idea. In scripture Philo finds one of these concepts, the other one is to be found by similarity through a *tertium comparationis*. The formula is $A : B = C : B / A = C$, i.e. A and B share C (I. Christiansen 1969:147). The allegorical method has also been described as a combination of this Hellenistic dieresis and the Jewish *gezerah shawa*, (i.e. inference from analogy).⁴²

In Winston and Dillon (1983:77) Dillon characterises the position of I. Christiansen as 'a rather desperate suggestion'. He accepts it as a general principle, but contends that it 'does not contribute to the explanation of the particular form which Philo employs', and he himself prefers to compare the Philonic exegesis with the Neoplatonic commentaries on Plato (primarily Proclus) and finds that they are working essentially in the same way. B. Mack (1984:250ff) accepts the dieretic structure in some Philonic pericopes and that I. Christiansen has raised an essential problem in explaining the logic of the allegorical method. Nevertheless, he argues that this kind of explanation is seen too much in philosophical terms that fail 'to satisfy those who want to understand his religious concerns as well' (Mack 1984:252). Nikiprowetzky (1977) is also among the scholars who see the limits of the Greek analogue of the allegorical method.⁴³

⁴² The *gezerah shawa* was one of Hillel's seven exegetical norms (Hamerton-Kelly 1976).

⁴³ 'En effet, Philon recourt à la méthode allégorique parce qu'il trouve en premier lieu le moyen de surmonter les difficultés inhérentes au texte de l'Écriture' (Nikiprowetzky 1977:27). Nikiprowetzky argues against the idea that Philo used allegory because he was a mystic.

Mack (1984:259) categorises I. Christiansen's the type of allegory as a 'reasoned allegory'.⁴⁴

Borgen (1984b:130–131) argues against I. Christiansen that she has put too much stress on the Hellenistic background of Philo and that she overlooks 'how allegorical methods and concepts are used by Philo to express and serve the cause of Judaism'.⁴⁵ However, Borgen (1997:149) is also willing to accept I. Christiansen's theory concerning different levels in Philo's interpretations of biblical texts.⁴⁶ There are two or sometimes even three exegetical levels of understanding: 'the concrete and specific level, the level of the cosmic and general principles, and the level of the divine realm of the

⁴⁴ See the discussion of Somn. 2:250 below. The method is as follows, a) citation, b) questions regarding a particular problems, c) answer in a brief statement, often by way of 'equivalence' between the word or phrase to be interpreted and the allegorical meaning, d) the reasons for the equivalent is given, e) further examples of reasons for the equivalence and f) an application of the meaning for the 'reader' is presented (Mack 1984:259–260).

The allegorical method in Philo has particularly been discussed by scholars in association with the place of Philo in the philosophical and/or Jewish tradition. Dillon (1977) defined Philo as a Middle Platonist which implies that Philo was less Stoic, but there were serious objections to this judgement (Runia 1986b:505–519). Runia who would rather view Philo as a philosopher 'of his own'. The question of whether Philo was a Middle Platonist has been treated in the 1993 edition of *Studia Philonica* (Runia 1993b). Runia (1993c) repeats previous critical conclusions while contending that Philo was a 'Platonizing expositor of scripture, showing a marked preference for using Middle Platonist doctrines in his exegesis'. He does not want to say that Philo was a Middle Platonist, however, only that he used some of their methods. Among Philo's clearly Platonic positions are his cosmological dualism and the understanding of the creation (Runia 1993c:130). Sterling (1993:110–111) concludes in the same issue of *Studia Philonica* that Philo's Moses was a kind of Middle Platonist, not a Middle Platonist tout court by arguing that Philo was thoroughly convinced of the validity both of Platonism and of his ancestral faith. These questions have some importance for the study of attitudes towards the temple, and will be discussed below.

⁴⁵ There are several typical Jewish features in his allegory, 1. The allegorical interpretation is akin to prophecy and fulfilment; it spells out the abstract principles hidden in the text, so that these may be applied to the experience of the individual and the whole Jewish community, and can serve as key to the interpretation of specific events. Philo develops principles that can be applied to specific events, such as the pogrom in Alexandria in 38 CE. 2. Philo makes the allegory serve the Jewish conviction of election. 3. Allegory is a method to make the Laws of Moses known to the Hellenistic world. 4. Philo uses elements from common Jewish exegetical traditions and fuses them with extra-Jewish elements. 5. Philo presupposes a unity between the people and the patriarchs, his interpretations of the patriarchs are therefore authoritative criteria for Jewish values (Borgen 1984b:130–131).

⁴⁶ Winston (1999:285) argues that Philo invented the interpretation of symbols on different levels.

beyond'. Borgen finds this understanding present in an exemplary way in Spec. 3:16 and especially the use of the word διακύπτω which most often means to stoop or peer so as to get a view of the inside. Borgen (1997:149) employs this understanding to argue that there is a hermeneutic key to Philo's writings:

The particular ordinances of the Jewish Law coincide with the universal cosmic principles. Thus to Philo universal principles and general principles do not undercut or cancel the specific ordinances or event of the Mosaic Law.

My aim is not to trace the backgrounds of Philo in milieus and writings of Platonic, Pythagorean, Stoic, Neoplatonic, Middle Platonic or Jewish character. It is rather to see if Philo's understandings of the temple and temple related issues with this hermeneutic key in mind may be a basis for information about the temple relationship of him and his fellow Jews that again may lead to some sociological conclusions for the Gospel of John. The Middle Platonic stamp of the Greek philosophical ideas in Philo with its Stoic and Pythagorean influence means that we cannot use Philo as a direct access to the background of John (see my comments below). But against the background of the discussion regarding Philo's allegorical exegesis it seems sociologically valuable to ask what it means for the evaluation of John's attitude that Philo operates with both a geographical temple and several transferred temples and related temple issues.

5.2.3.3 *Transferred Temple Building*

In several passages, Philo uses a body-soul dichotomy similar to the one indicated in Migr. 93 (outward observances = the body, inner meaning = the soul) and Opif. 136 is a telling example. The passage is part of an exposition of Gen 2:7, saying that the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and Philo follows up by saying that the body made from dust was the sacred dwelling place or shrine that was fashioned for the reasonable (logical) soul. This text is interesting in two ways, it presents a positive view of the body in contrast to other statements of Philo and it presents the image of a body as temple, a similar image to the one used about the body of Jesus in Jn 2:21—with the difference that John does not say that the body is an abode for the soul particularly, but identifies the body of a historical person with a temple.

Opif. 136–137 is primarily concerned with the first man, not with man or human kind in general. This is evident from earlier parts

of *De opificio mundi*. In *Opif.* 34, Philo shows that he differs diachronically between the history of creation in Gen 1 and the one in Gen 2. First, in Gen 1, God created the idea of man in his image that was neither male nor female, an object of thought, incorporeal and incorruptible, Philo argues. Secondly, in Gen 2, he created the first man and woman. The first man was perfect in all ways.⁴⁷ The perfection was the reason for God being able to breathe the breath of life into the dust. God selected the best parts of earth 'out of pure material' (ἐκ καθαρῶς ὕλης in *Opif.* 137).

The fact that Philo only uses the image of the body as temple in connection with a *past* event, may be said to reduce the importance of this image for our sociological reconstruction of his attitudes towards temple(s) in the second temple period to some degree. However, it may also reduce the impression of Philo as a temple replacer in that he does not compare the body with a temple, but only with a very special connection, the first man. The image 'body as temple' is an image that does not contrast the Jerusalem temple, because of the particular status granted to the first man in a time before the temple. It does, however, point to the fact that Philo regards items other than buildings to be a worthy place for God. A similar transference is also expressed through the image of Israel as 'temple and priest'. In *QE* 1:10, Philo interprets Exod 12:6b about sacrifice at the time of the exodus from Egypt and says that because the temple had not been built the gathering of Israel is a temple:

... because a temple had not yet been built, He showed that the dwelling together of several good persons in the home was a temple and altar.⁴⁸

It is in the very same paragraph that Philo expresses the idea that this particular (Jewish) group of people also establishes a priesthood acting on behalf of the rest of the world. This idea is mentioned several places. At the beginning of *Spec.* 2:163 Philo writes: τὸ δ' αἴτιον, ὅτι ὃν λόγον ἔχει πρὸς πόλιν ἱερεὺς, τοῦτον πρὸς ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος.⁴⁹ The idea of a nation or congregation

⁴⁷ Cf. 'surpassing all the men that now are, and all that have been before us.' '... the man first fashioned was clearly the bloom of our entire race, and never have his descendants attained the like bloom, forms and faculties ever feebler having been bestowed on each succeeding generation' (*Opif.* 140).

⁴⁸ Translated from Armenian by Marcus (1953). See also Terian (1992).

⁴⁹ 'The reason of this is that the Jewish nation is to the whole inhabited world

of special importance is therefore not only a past and time-related idea, it is also a present idea of functioning importance.

The transferences of the temple building referred to here do *not* represent temple ideas that are in contrast to the idea of a Jerusalem temple and temple ordinances in a sociologically significant way.

5.2.3.4 *Soul and Mind as Temple*

The human soul and mind is presented as a temple or house of God in several ways. Virt. 188 says that reason, λογισμός, is a more becoming abode for God (cf. νεὼν ἀξιοπρεπέστερον οὐχ εὗρεν ἐπὶ γῆς λογισμοῦ). In Praem. 123, the mind (διάνοια) is also described as a ‘house of God’ in the expression οἶκος θεοῦ σοφοῦ διάνοια. The most extensive use of the concept of temple in Philo stands in relation with ‘cosmos’ and ‘soul’, and in Spec. 1:84–97 Philo says that there are two sanctuaries, the cosmos on the level of macrocosm and the rational, invisible soul on the level of microcosm. In the former, Logos is high priest and in the latter man is.

In Somn. 1:215, Philo is stating the same view; there are two kinds of sanctuaries, the universe, and the rational soul (see Heinemann 1962:45). In Her. 75, the difference between the two sanctuaries, the soul and the cosmos, is clearly stated. Starting with the preceding paragraph (§74), we see that he lodges an appeal to ‘dedicate them [gifts of thinking etc.] to Him Who is the source of accurate thinking and unerring apprehension’ (§74). Then he continues:

This dedication will be enshrined in the holier of the great sanctuaries. For two such sanctuaries, we feel, exist, one sensible, one mental. This world is the cathedral of the sense-perceived order, the world which the mind discovers of the truly invisible order (Her. 75).

The tabernacle was a representation and copy of wisdom, σοφίας ἀπεικόνισμα καὶ μίμημα. In Her. 123, the reason for presenting this copy is the need of piety, πρὸς εὐσέβειαν (of men), while the reason for God to be present is ‘because of pity’, δι’ ἔλεον (see Heinemann 1962:46). We may say that the two sanctuaries are related dialectically, there is a temple in each of the worlds and the invisible is the most holy of them (τὸ ἀγιώτερον).

what the priest is to the State’ (Spec. 2: 163) or more precisely ‘to the city’ (πρὸς πόλιν). On the idea of the Jews being the priesthood for the rest of the world, see chapter 8.

In QE 2:51 and Cher. 101, the sanctified reason in the soul of the logic creation is said to be an image of the divine reason immanent in the cosmos, οἶκον οὖν ἐπίγειον τὴν ἀόρατον ψυχὴν τοῦ ἀοράτου θεοῦ λέγοντες ἐνδίκως καὶ κατὰ νόμον φήσομεν.⁵⁰ It is the sanctified reason that transforms the human soul into a small universe, the microcosm, which dedicates it to God and makes a temple of it, a temple where the divinity manifests itself just as often as in the macrocosm. In the whole section Cher. 97–106, the temple is nothing but an image of the soul that the sage prepares in order to make it a worthy house so that God may come down and rest in it (extract from Cher. 99–100):

What house shall be prepared for God the Kings of kings, the Lord of all . . . ? Shall it be of stone or timber? Away with the thought, the very words are blasphemy. For though the whole world should suddenly turn into gold, or something more precious than gold . . . yet there would be no place where His feet could tread. One worthy house there is—the soul that is fitted to receive him.

Thus, not every soul is a temple to God—only the one that is fitted with a certain rational and moral level. In Somn. 1:149, Philo exclaims passionately, ‘Be zealous, O my soul, to become a house of God, a holy temple’ (σπούδαζε οὖν, ὦ ψυχή, θεοῦ οἶκος γενέσθαι, ἱερὸν ἅγιον), in this way demonstrating both the dual possibility for the soul of both being a temple and not.⁵¹ When speaking of the soul as temple in Cher. 101, Philo has left the analogy and speaks of a difference between the soul and the Jerusalem temple. In Her. 75, we see that there is a difference of degree, while in Cher. 101 there is an analogy between the cosmos and the soul, and these two entities are declared to be temples as well.

On the basis of these passages, the impression of Philo as operating with temple ideas capable of replacing the temple institution of Jerusalem has been reinforced, as the reason for the existence and adherence of a specific and visible temple in Jerusalem does not seem compulsory to him. Still, the Jerusalem temple is not contradicted

⁵⁰ ‘Justly and rightly then shall we say that in the invisible soul the invisible God has His earthly dwelling-place’ (Cher. 101).

⁵¹ Paul uses the same figure in relation to the body as temple in 1 Cor 6:19 ‘or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you . . . ?’ The same idea is expressed in Somn. 2:248 and Praem. 123.

and from a sociological point of view, there is little evidence to conclude that the soul and mind were seen as adequate temples.

5.2.3.5 *Cosmos as Temple, Spec. 1:66ff*

The idea that κόσμος is a temple is found several places, but above all in Spec. 1:66ff (the true temple is the cosmos, but there is also a temple ‘made by hands’). A similar idea is presented in Mos. 2:67ff saying that the tabernacle was a temple, an image of the cosmos.⁵² This is an idea in which certain temple replacements of sociological significance are inherent. With a cosmic temple, there might have been little significance left for the Jerusalem temple and its sacrifices.

Spec. 1:66ff is of special importance since Philo presents arguments concerning a connection between the uniqueness of God and the one temple. At the end of Spec. 1:67 Philo writes: προϋνόησε δ’ ὡς οὔτε πολλαχόθι οὔτ’ ἐν ταύτῳ πολλὰ κατασκευασθήσεται ἱερά, δικαιώσας, ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, καὶ ἱερὸν ἐν εἶναι μόνον.⁵³ This is not only a theological argument concerning the unique Lord, but also an argument for going on pilgrimage. He thereby supports the pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the temple there in a unique way.⁵⁴

The impression of thorough temple support is reinforced by a further look at the wider context of the treatise *De specialibus legibus*. The treatise is among the writings of Philo in which the Law is re-written in a systematic fashion (see above). In *De Decalogo*, Philo divides the ten commandments in two groups, five on each tablet. The commandments on the first tablet concern the duties of man towards God, on the second tablet the duties concern other human beings. Each of these groups has two particular treatises in Philo, Spec. 1–2 discuss the laws of the first tablet, Spec. 3 and 4 the second tablet. At the end of the last book, he presents how he under-

⁵² Früchtel (1968) has examined different aspects of the concepts of cosmos in Philo. Cosmos as God’s temple is analysed in a chapter in which she is particularly interested in finding the origin of this concept within the history of Greek philosophy (1968:69–115). See also Heinemann (1962:46). The Jewish background is evident. Josephus speaks of the Tabernacle as an imitation of universal nature (μίμησις τῆς τῶν ὅλων φύσεως) in *Antiq.* 3:123, see also *Antiq.* 3:179–187; *Bell.* 5:212–213. See the note on Josephus in Thackeray (1930:403, n. b).

⁵³ ‘But he provided that there should not be temples built either in many places or many in the same place, for he judged that since God is one, there should be also only one temple’ (Spec. 1:67).

⁵⁴ A parallel thought is found in Josephus *Antiq.* 4:200; *Contra Ap.* 2:193, ‘one temple for the one God’ without referring to pilgrimage. See Amir (1983:52–64).

stands the Law in terms of general virtues such as justice, courage and humanity. This thread is followed up in treatises *De virtutibus* and *De praemiis et poenis*.

Spec. 1 deals with the prescriptions that concern the duties of man towards God. The passage Spec. 1:66–78 is part of a section concerning the temple and it is also closely connected to a section dealing with the functions of the priests (§§79–130). The heading of this passage *Περὶ ἱεροῦ* is inserted in some manuscripts,⁵⁵ indicating the issue in focus. Philo ends §65 by declaring that he will now describe how Moses thinks one ought to honour the ‘one truly existing God’, and he introduces §66 by saying that ‘The highest, and in the truest sense the holy, temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe’ (ὁ σύμπας κόσμος) in which heaven is sanctuary, the stars ornaments and the angels, the incorporeal souls, are priests. Philo seems to think that God really does not need any sacrifice of the physical kind.⁵⁶ However, as Philo also writes in §67, there is another temple as well, the one made by hands (τὸ χειρόκμητον). The reason for having this hand-made temple within the other one (the cosmos) is functional or practical: the temple was made for those who want to pay their tribute to piety and desire by means of sacrifices. The sacrifices are therefore necessary, but not for God, only for man. It was desirable to cut short their eagerness or intentions (ὀρμαί). For this purpose God demanded that there should be only *one* temple. Those who are eager to sacrifice, should not perform rites in their houses, but go to Jerusalem (§68). Philo argues that God wants to test their dispositions, those who are not so eager do not bother to take the trouble to travel away from home and endure separation from their most familiar and dearest friends. He proves this need for zeal by pointing at the fact that people who make a pilgrimage are quite eager in their religious devotion (§69).⁵⁷

There are similarities in the writings of Plato on this matter that demonstrates that Philo was not the only philosopher with a double

⁵⁵ As indicated in the Loeb edition (Colson 1937:137, n. d) and added to the Greek text in the French edition (Daniel 1975:48).

⁵⁶ See Spec. 1:152, and also the allegorical understanding of sacrifices and feasts in passages like *Sacr.* 84, 111.

⁵⁷ Amir points to the fact that the journey to Jerusalem was hardly as difficult as Philo wants us to believe and that his main point is better understood in terms of Stoic ideas (Amir 1983:58–59).

attitude. Heinemann (1962:48–49) points to the fact that Philo is following a common Hellenistic doctrine when claiming that the *whole world* is the temple of the Divinity. On the other hand, Daniel (1975:L–LI) argues that contrary to most philosophers of his time, Philo does not deny all the value of the cultus, in spite of the fact that he regards the whole world to be the true temple.⁵⁸ In an article from 1967 on Philo's sacrifices and temple, Nikiprowetzky (1967a:111) points to the similarities with Plato both here and in other passages. In *Leges* 10:909d Plato says that ἱερὰ μηδὲ εἷς ἐν ἰδίαις οἰκίαις ἐκτῆσθω ('No one shall possess a shrine in his own house', cf. Bury 1926:2, 385). The reasons presented for this prescription are purely practical or functional, e.g. to prevent the impious to act in an impious way (*Leges* 10:910a). Philo expresses a similar standpoint in *Spec.* 1:68, εἶτα τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις αὐτῶν ἱερουργεῖν οὐκ ἐφίησιν ('Further, he does not consent to those who wish to perform the rites in their houses'). Plato seems to be arguing against those who think that God can be influenced by prayer, an opinion implying that this was a current view in his day. Saunders (1975:408) argues that Plato here is actually defending the existence of absolute moral standards, standards that in principle cannot be influenced by any relative human values such as praying. Nevertheless, Plato lacks the practical-epistemological reasons, expressed by Philo in *Migr.* 93, i.e. the view that the observance of the Law leads to a better understanding of the matters they represent (see also chapter 3). In this way, Philo is able to argue for the uniqueness of Moses, the Law—including the role of Jerusalem temple.

We see that according to Philo, the only place for a man's legitimate cultus of the Divinity is essentially linked to the Jerusalem temple that is the second temple of the unique God. It is the only place because this second geographical temple is an image of the first one, the form or idea of temple.⁵⁹ Indirectly, the cosmic understanding of the temple and related issues is in accordance with the belief in the Lord as creator of all things. The cosmic significance of the temple and related issues rather seems to strengthen their social importance than reduce it.

⁵⁸ There are of course other similarities between Plato and Philo as well, see Runia (1981).

⁵⁹ For a further discussion of the relation between form and images, see chapter 3 in connection with the discussion of *Migr.* 86–93.

5.2.3.6 *Other Transferred Temple Related Issues*

The subsequent section concerns the configuration of the temple edifice and in particular a detailed description of the high priest's clothes. In Somn. 2:250, the city of Jerusalem is interpreted allegorically. Although this is a text about Jerusalem, the passage is included here because it is, after all, relevant both in relation to the meaning of the temple in Philo generally as well as in relation to the understanding of the temple institution and the Jerusalem temple in the Gospel of John. When transferring the temple idea and priestly clothes to the ideas of the cosmos, Philo extends temple issues that, despite his statements to the contrary, neither contradict nor threaten the status or importance of the Jerusalem temple.

Somn. 2:250 takes us to an allegorical understanding of 'Jerusalem'.⁶⁰ The passage is part of Philo's treatise *De somniis* (1–2) that again is a part of the *Allegorical Commentary of Genesis* (Gen 1–17), of which twenty treatises are extant. *De somniis* 1–2 is a discussion of several dreams reported in Genesis—about Jacob and his dreams at Bethel as well as the dreams of Joseph. In his detailed and complicated exegesis, Philo again expresses his conviction that the dreams recounted in the holy scriptures cannot be understood literally, and therefore must be filled with hidden meanings. The hidden meanings of the dreams can only be disclosed by allegorical exposition. Philo divides the dreams into three categories. We seem to have the last two categories in the two books in the manuscripts preserved:

1. The first category is the dreams in which the dreamer does not participate (the book is lacking, but we have references to it at the beginning of Somn. 1).
2. The second category (Somn. 1) concerns the dreams in which the spirit is inspired and may make prophecies on future events.
3. The last category (Somn. 2) from which our passage originates, treats the dreams that only present symbols that have to be interpreted by a professional interpreter of dreams.⁶¹

⁶⁰ 'Now the city of God is called in the Hebrew Jerusalem and its name when translated is 'vision of peace'. Therefore do not seek for the city of the Existent among the regions of the earth, since it is not wrought of wood or stone, but in a soul, in which there is no warring, whose sight is keen, which has set before it as its aim to live in contemplation and peace' (Somn. 2:250).

⁶¹ Yet, as Savinel (1962) points out, Philo does not draw substantial significance out of this categorisation.

Our passage, Somn. 2:250, is a part of the section on Joseph's interpretation of the dream of Pharaoh (Somn. 2:215–302) in Gen 41:17–42.⁶² Pharaoh, who falls asleep a second time, dreams a parallel dream concerning the seven ears of grain, as Philo himself recounts. After a long introduction in which Philo states that God is truly stable, he concludes that the quality of immutability subsists as an attribute primarily to God, second, to his Logos, third, to the sage, and fourth, to 'the man of gradual progress' (cf. the expression *περὶ τὸν προκόπτοντα*, §237). The wicked man is on the other hand, not stable, he is 'carried to and fro as in a flood' (*φορούμενος ὥσπερ ἐν κατακλυσμῷ*). When *κατακλυσμός* is mentioned, Philo turns back to the dream of Pharaoh, who, as the story goes, stood by a river. This river must be understood symbolically, Philo argues.

Ποταμός ('river/stream') is in fact the symbol of speech (§238). As a flood or stream, the speech has two natures, the one is irrigation and beneficial, the latter a flood and injurious. Compared to the formula of allegory ($A : B = C : B \rightarrow A = C$) we observe that 'stream' is A and 'speech' is C, the 'irrigating and beneficial character' is B, ergo 'stream' is the symbol of 'speech'. According to Philo, Moses has provided an example of both: one is from Gen 2:10 "A river" he says, 'goes out of Eden to water the garden, thence it separates into four heads'. The Divine Logos is then linked to a river that descends from the fountain of wisdom. Our passage is another example, allegorically introduced, of the beneficial nature of the stream, 'And there is another psalm which runs thus: 'The strong current of the river makes glad the city of God'. What city?' (§246). Philo has found an apparent contradiction in the text. Could it be Jerusalem, 'the holy city, where the sacred temple also is'? A very doubtful thought indeed! In the neighbourhood of Jerusalem there are actually neither rivers nor seas, a fact indicating that the author must have had another city in mind, and Philo has thus demonstrated that, according to his judgement, the citation from the psalm can only be read allegorically, ὡς δῆλον εἶναι, ὅτι τοῦ προφανοῦς ἕτερόν τι βούλεται δι' ὑπονοιῶν παραστήσαι.⁶³ The river is the Logos, the Logos is actually operating all over the world, and it becomes clear

⁶² The dream is recounted by Philo in §§216–217.

⁶³ 'Thus it is clear that he writes to shew us allegorically something different from the obvious' (Somn. 2:246).

that the city mentioned in the scriptural passage must be the whole world, not just the location of Jerusalem, cf. πόλιν γὰρ θεοῦ καθ' ἓνα μὲν τρόπον τὸν κόσμον καλεῖ ('for God's city is the name in one sense for the world', Somn. 2:248).⁶⁴

Thus, the name 'Jerusalem' is not just a designation of a geographical site. In Philo's translation it means 'vision of peace', another allegorical derivation, here based on etymology. The 'Existent' (ὁ ὄν) cannot therefore dwell in a city of wood and stone, but in a particular kind of soul, with no warring, with a keen sight, living in contemplation and peace. Philo is arguing in a way that seems to diminish the significance of the Jerusalem temple to a rather low level. If we looked at this passage in isolation, we could easily conclude that Philo had abandoned temple Judaism.

Considering the transferences of the temple, it is no wonder that the high priest, worship, and sacrifice are transferred in a similar way too. In QE 2:107–124, Philo explains the meaning of the priestly vestment (Exod 28) in both the literal and the 'deeper meaning'.⁶⁵ In the part commenting on the breastplate of the high priest (QE 2:110–117, ad Exod 28:15ff), he reflects on the fact that the high priest is to wear the breastplate only when entering the sanctuary. Allegorically, the sanctuary is here understood as the place of holiness, piety, and every virtue, which is perfect reason. Accordingly when the mind (intellectus) reaches this stage of holiness, it also acquires perfect reason, 'quand l'esprit atteint ce stade, il acquiert aussi une parfaite reason' (QE 2:115). The formulation indicates that Philo regards both the animal sacrifice and the sacrifices of the souls as legitimate parallels (see Seland 1995a).

In Fug. 108, the high priest is declared to be the Divine Logos and not a man, cf. λέγομεν γὰρ τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι. With this allegorical interpretation Philo tries to prevent a difficulty he finds in the prescription of Num 35:28; that

⁶⁴ The allegorical method followed here by Philo is in accordance with the allegorical method called 'reasoned allegory' (see the references above to I. Christiansen and Mack).

⁶⁵ 'Haec litera. Ad mentem vero illud, etc.', i.e. 'Voilà pour la lettre. Voici le sens allégorique: etc.' QE 2:107. The French and Latin citations in the study are from the French translation of the Armenian text by Terian and the Latin translation by Aucher, see Terian (1992:ad loc). On allegorical explanations of the vestments of the priests, see Josephus Antiq. 3:179ff.

the death of the high priest abrogates the reasons assigned for the limit of the exile of the slayer—a prescription that Philo finds absurd. Therefore, he explains that the death of the high priest at this place means the death of the Logos in the soul, which again signifies that when the Logos is dead, the evil will return.⁶⁶ In Ebr. 87, the high priest is described as standing before the inner altar dealing only with things bloodless, fleshless, bodiless and born of reason, cf. κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἔνδον πᾶσιν ἀναίμοις, ἀσάρκοις, ἀσωμάτοις, τοῖς ἐκ λογισμοῦ μόνοις χρήσεται. This citation is part of a section in which Philo comments on the description of the tabernacle in Exod 25:10; 27:1; 28:4; 30:1. In Det. 21, Philo declares that genuine worship is that of a soul bringing truth, cf. [θεραπείαι] γνήσιοι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ ψυχῆς ψιλὴν καὶ μόνην θυσίαν φερούσης ἀλήθειαν. A similar critique of the animal sacrifices is also to be found in various parts of Greek philosophy (see Nikiprowetzky 1967b).⁶⁷

5.2.4 *Temple Ambivalence*

One of the methodological problems when dealing with Philo is that he, although very rational, was neither a systematic theologian nor a pure philosopher. Several authors, like Bréhier, Heinemann, Früchtel, Mendelson, Goodenough, Borgen, Williamson, have studied the temple ideas in Philo and have inferred socio-historical conclusions from them. Scholars often point to the fact that it may be difficult to find a consistent view when we consider all of Philo's statements on a particular subject.⁶⁸ This is exactly the case concerning his treatment of the issue studied here as well. Philo's expressed relationship to the Jerusalem temple and temple related issues as studied above, is ambivalent, at least the evidence seems ambiguous or seems to reflect an ambiguous attitude. We find an explicit adherence on the one side and a criticism on the other, we find extended temple ideas that can be interpreted as replacement of the temple institution but also as its support.

⁶⁶ See Heinemann (1962:405–406); Starobinski-Safran (1970:279–281). Philo also discusses the problem in Spec. 1:161; 3:131–136, see Colson (1937:638).

⁶⁷ Nikiprowetzky also argues that Gärtner is wrong in claiming that a spiritual interpretation of idols may originate in Qumran, see Gärtner (1965:50–51). Gärtner seems to have been unaware of the fact that Philo uses the same formulation (Spec. 1:2).

⁶⁸ See Arnaldez (1961:2) and Runia (1986a).

This ambiguous pattern is in accordance with a biblical pattern, but there are few reasons to doubt that the statements concerning the temple tax do not reflect his practice and the practice of other Alexandrian Jews. An ambivalence is seen in relation to the several aspects of the Mosaic Law as Philo himself describes it. This is particularly evident when he deals with the Jerusalem temple buildings. He declares that the temple tax is ordained by the Law (Spec. 1:78) but also explains why the Diaspora Jews did not attend every temple festival (Mos. 2:232), and according to Plant. 126, one cannot genuinely express one's gratitude to God by means of buildings and sacrifices. He seems ambivalent concerning the significance of the temporal, geographical, and visible (by the senses) phenomena, and when he describes extended temple ideas. There is a certain inconclusiveness concerning accepting or rejecting the Jerusalem temple and its functions.

Philo's passages indicating a rejection of the temple find parallels in the Old Testament/Tanakh in its critique of animal sacrifices, and also in Hellenistic philosophical literature describing 'spiritualised worship', as well as in writings like the Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The transference of the temple ideas from the temporal temple to other areas finds a place recognisable also within in a Middle Platonic-inspired dualistic philosophy.⁶⁹ Similarly to the Platon-like hermeneutics and epistemology, he uses the allegorical interpretation to trace the noetic and only truly existing forms from the objective world. Philo presents different transferences of the temple to 'body', 'soul', 'congregation' and 'cosmos'. 'Body' and 'congregation' are items that are said to have materialised as temples even before the construction of the temple in Jerusalem, according to Philo. 'Cosmos' is both a past and present entity, the universe is God's true visible temple, and the 'soul' is the invisible and is therefore even a truer temple than the universe. The temple images are thus presented as entities where the one God 'reveals himself' i.e. in a body, in a congregation, in a soul, or in the cosmos. His attitude seems in many ways just as 'uninteresting' as it has been argued (mostly on the background of Spec. 1:66–67 and Mos. 2:67ff), but

⁶⁹ The doctrine of two worlds is clearly Platonic. Philo's appropriation of the role of rationality is a general conviction in Greek philosophy, while doctrines such as God's transcendence, are strongly controlled by Jewish convictions, see Runia (1993c:130).

this conclusion nevertheless turns out to be oversimplified for the overall picture of Philo's relationship with temple Judaism. The parallel way of thinking (body = observance, soul = the real meaning) is the essential factor in Philo's criticism of the temple, but also demonstrates a dependence on the 'body'-part. His reports that the Alexandrians observed the Law concerning the pilgrimage and the temple tax (Spec. 1:77–78) are the primary reason for saying that he accepts and supports the temple institution in Jerusalem in an essential way.

To sum up, we see that:

1. The temple in Jerusalem is by Philo looked upon as a centre for all Jews, and Jewish Alexandrians observed the ordinance prescribing the paying of a temple tax and the necessity of pilgrimage. Despite the criticism of temple buildings and related issues, Philo demonstrates his loyalty and probably also the loyalty of most fellow Jewish Alexandrians. We find some essential theological arguments for the Jerusalem temple. Since there is only one God, there should be only one temple, Philo argues. He depends on the one temple in Jerusalem to trace the true meaning of a temple and of the Lord. The Jerusalem temple is even said to be the perfect image of the ideal temple and for that reason must have a unique place above all other temples in the world and naturally among Jews. He defends temple Judaism and the observance of the Law on functional grounds, such as the common need for piety and pilgrimage, but above all to avoid attacks from those who do not tolerate the neglect of the traditions, statements that indicate that Philo was not alone in this matter.
2. Philo demonstrates his own loyalty and support of the Alexandrian practice. He himself went to Jerusalem to 'offer up prayers and sacrifices' (Prov. 2:64). The delegation to Rome, in which he played a major role, reacted spontaneously when it heard about the threat to the temple by Gaius (Legat. 188–190).
3. Philo speaks of a transferred or 'spiritualised' temple and of transferred temple related issues, such as the Tabernacle, the vestments of the priest, the sacrifices etc. In one way, these transferences reflect a superior reality, but in another way, he is dependent on the phenomena that these transferences rep-

resent. Through observance, the allegorist gains an improved knowledge of the inner meanings of the external symbols.

Philo also presents mostly negative attitudes towards Gentile cultus and non-Jewish temples (see chapter 8). A combination of these factors all in all strengthens the theories about Philo that claim that he was loyal to temple Judaism and indicate how he, a first century Diaspora Jew, could combine negative and positive statements towards the Jerusalem temple and its cultus. In spite of his criticism of animal sacrifices and the fundamental rejection of temples of stone, and the location of the universal God to one locale, Philo was a Jerusalem temple adherent. He has been described as 'a conqueror on the verge of being conquered' (Borgen 1984b:150–154). Nevertheless, he never supports an abrogation of the main Jewish temple institution, and he even criticises those who do.

5.3 THE TEMPLE IN THE QUMRAN WRITINGS

5.3.1 *Did the Qumran Community Reject the Temple?*

The temple question has also been a much analysed issue in the scholarship of the Qumran literature and different opinions are still debated.⁷⁰ The main studies on the temple subject in comparison with the New Testament are still Gärtner (1965:16–46) and Klinzing (1971) but recent and former published evidence are being

⁷⁰ The scholarly literature on the subject 'the temple in Qumran' is to a large degree integrated in comparisons with other literature, especially the New Testament. For studies on the relationship to the temple in the Qumran writings themselves, see the discussions in Gärtner (1965:16–46); Klinzing (1971); Schwartz (1979); Talmon (1986); Dimant (1986); Wentling (1989); Knohl (1992); Stegemann (1992a; 1994:242); Schmidt (1994); Ringren (1995:214ff); Brooke (1999b); Kampen (1999) in addition to the comments in translations of the Rule of the Community (1QS et al.). The issue is also discussed in several articles in Ego, Lange, and Pilhofer (1999). Particularly interesting for my conclusions in additions to Adna's article are the articles by Avemarie; Brooke; Böttrich; Schiffman. I have also commented on some of these articles in earlier chapters.

On the relationship between the Gospel of John and the Qumran writings, see below. The relationship between Philo and Qumran has particularly been discussed in connection with the references to the Essenes in Philo (see below) and also his remarks on the Therapeutae in *De vita contemplativa*. Few have compared Philo and Qumran but see the comparison made by Nikiprowetzky (1967b) in his review of Gärtner (1965) and see Harvey (1996).

re-examined.⁷¹ Both these authors and the majority of Qumran scholars maintain that the Qumran community no longer sacrificed in the temple, and that the community had replaced the temple in its essential functions. Gärtner argues that because of the practice that made the members of the community think that the temple was defiled (referring to CD 20:22–23),⁷² it was ‘the community [that] came to replace the temple of Jerusalem; they themselves were ‘the new temple’ and that the old temple ‘would be replaced by a new one, of quite new dimensions’ (1965:16), i.e. seeing the possibilities for a new eschatological temple. From Gärtner’s point of view, the community did not perform animal sacrifice. Klinzing concludes that the community had not initiated a new temple with animal sacrifice, but regarded the members themselves to be the true temple by saying that ‘Der wahre Tempel ist die Gemeinde selbst; auf sie werden die Tempelbegriffe übertragen angewendet’ (1971:41). In other words, this is an example of the *replacement theory* and it is the replacement theory in relation to the Qumran community that shall be studied and tested below in a falsification procedure and later compared to John.

Gärtner (1965:119ff) has paralleled the Qumran material on the temple with the historical Jesus and includes the Gospel of John as well. The similarities between the historical Jesus and some Qumran writings are conspicuous and it seems likely, according to Gärtner, that ‘Jesus knew of Qumran’s sharp criticism of the Jerusalem temple and its cultus’ (1965:122). Both in Qumran and in the New Testament there is evidence saying that Messianic self-consciousness and temple symbols were connected and in both writings we find

⁷¹ Neither of these authors compare the Qumran evidence with the Gospel of John or Philo to any large extent. For a description of the relationship between the viewpoints of Gärtner and Klinzing, see further down. A recent evaluation of the historical or genetic links between similarities of John and the Essenes on their alleged common dualism is presented by Aune (2003) who concludes that any such link is suspect and that the viability to explain similarities in genetic terms continues to prove elusive (2003:303).

See also Braun (1966a:118ff; 1966b:96ff); Fiorenza (1976); Evans (1992); E. Christiansen (1995:145ff). Wenschkewitz (1932) compares transferences in early Judaism (‘Spätjudentum’ i.e. apocrypha, pseudepigrapha and rabbinical literature), Stoic philosophy, Philo, Jesus, Paul, the Letter to the Hebrews, Revelation and 1 Peter, in addition to the Johannine writings.

⁷² CD 20 is not a part of the reconstructed CD-B of Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:579).

the common Jewish principle that the individual and collective may replace each other.⁷³ Jesus and the Qumranites followed the same principles with criticism and replacement (Gärtner 1965:122ff).

Contra Gärtner, the scholarly discussions particularly after the release of new manuscripts in the early 1990's, have now brought in nuances to the view of an isolated Qumran community not participating in the Jerusalem temple at all. The main problem with much of the earlier discussions such as the one found in Gärtner, is that they analyse the terms too much in the tradition of the history of ideas. P. Davies (1996)⁷⁴ points to the fact that the passages dealing with the temple in CD present a contradictory picture. On the one side, we find several regulations in the legal part of the document,⁷⁵ statements presupposing temple participation. On the other side we find statements clearly betraying a fundamental rejection of the temple, a picture seen in CD as well the Qumran fragments of the document (4QD; 5QD; 6QD).⁷⁶ The statements by Josephus and Philo that the Essenes did not participate in the temple cultus, in combination with the CD testimony, tend to reinforce the impression of contradiction.⁷⁷ P. Davies argues that the most negative statements in CD are secondary glosses (P. Davies 1996:45–60). He concludes

⁷³ Gärtner (1965:123ff) argues that the association with individualistic terms like 'Ebed Yahweh (Servant of the Lord), Son of man, Son of God, and Son of David' in 'late Judaism' is taken to refer to a collective, the people of Israel. In Qumran texts, there is in fact no individual Messiah to which such terms refer, he argues. They are always interpreted collectively (p. 125). Contra Gärtner, Klinzing (1971: 212–213) points to the fact, however, that there is no Messianic understanding in the Qumran material comparable to the one found in the New Testament, at least there is no such understanding in connection with the temple passages.

⁷⁴ P. Davies has analysed the attitudes towards the temple as indicated in the Damascus Document (CD) in a study from 1982 that focuses on a similar problem to the one I'll analyse in this chapter (see also P. Davies 1983).

⁷⁵ The second part of the writing (column 9–16) is usually called the 'Law' (P. Davies 1994:48).

⁷⁶ For these fragments, see Martínez (1994:47ff, 70–71).

⁷⁷ They kept away from the temple and declined animal sacrifice according to Josephus Antiq. 18:19 and Philo Prob. 75. But in this passage Josephus tells that they had not rejected the temple and the sacrifices completely as he also confirms that they did send offerings to the temple, εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερόν ἀναθήματα κτλ., unless a negation should be added. Some Essenes are, however, present at the temple, e.g. Judas the Essene in Josephus Bell. 1:78, see Stegemann (1992b:124–125). For the discussion of Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Bergmeier (1993) and Beall (1988). Beall points to at least two important halakic discrepancies between these corpora, entry rules, and marriage.

similarly in another study that the community did not boycott the temple, but 'did not believe the temple could be used except under the terms of its own halachah' (P. Davies 1983:202). Schiffman (1999) describes what he looks upon as the community's withdrawal from the temple seen in both the disagreements regarding particular rituals and the calendar question (4QMMT), separation from the temple (e.g. CD 6:11–12), texts claiming that the sect and its rituals were substitutes for the temple (e.g. 1QS 8:1–16; 9:3–5; 1QSa 2:3–11). Their continued study of laws of sacrifice, their expected control of the temple in the future, the plans for a new temple, their own laws as understandable only as substitutes for the temple regulations and the hope for a new final temple made by God, also point in that same direction. Like the Jews of the Diaspora the Qumran group had to face the absence of the temple much earlier than most of the Jewish community, Schiffman (1999:280) concludes.

However, the evidence is not conclusive in relation to the question of *substitute* of the temple versus *supplement* to the temple. Philo is an example of Jewish point of view that rejected and accepted the temple at the same time, in different ways, and the temple had many functions in the Jewish community. Moreover, Stegemann (1992b; 1994) even claims that the Essenes, as indicated by the Qumran writings, represented the main Jewish movement at that time.⁷⁸ In that case, ambivalence should perhaps be expected from a protest movement heavily involved in the institution it opposed.

Gärtner (1965:19), who also saw the inherent contradictions tried to conciliate them by arguing that the negative statements are directed towards the Jerusalem temple, while the positive statements are connected to their different temple transferences of the temple, e.g. the congregation itself. However, it is difficult to postulate two kinds of references to statements of the same kind, statements that themselves do not mark any differences of direction. Klinzing (1971:89) explained the lack of temple replacement in manuscripts like 1QH and 1QM, that all manuscripts originated under shifting historical periods and that a unified attitude should not be expected.

⁷⁸ Stegemann (1971:225ff) argues, inferring from the laws in CD, that the originators first participated in the temple cultus, but that the Teacher and a part of the community left the other members of the group. CD is thus pointing towards a period of time in the history of the community before the segregation at Qumran. Stegemann (1994) later argued that these Essenes also participated in the temple cultus after the segregation, at least to some degree.

Charlesworth (1996:79) sums up the recent trends in Qumran scholarship and argues that both the Johannine community and the Qumran community were 'sects' as they both incorporate several similar traits:

1. They are both cut off from other Jews and vehemently reject the temple cultus (Qumran) or are excluded from the synagogue service (John),
2. They both established strong social barriers, particularly 1 Jn demonstrates an apprehension of living in liminal time, and
3. They both claim to have secret knowledge.

In addition, there is a similar language of light and darkness, a common mentality of a dual world.⁷⁹ From my point of view, it is feature 1 (their isolation and rejection of the parent body) that functions as a 'test case' in the evaluation of the 'sectarian' claim. I shall argue that there is counter-evidence that has to be considered as well. Charlesworth (1996:80) argues that their ideas, symbols, and technical terms were widely known by other Jews, seen especially in the Gospel of John. This fact, however, may strengthen the thesis opposite to that of Charlesworth, i.e. that these groups were *less* isolated and segregated. A truly esoteric group is not expected to share its insights; if this language and ways of thinking were common knowledge at the time, the groups can hardly be considered completely isolated.⁸⁰ Charlesworth argues that the Johannine community was under direct influence of the Qumran community, and that at least some Essenes joined the Johannine community (Charlesworth 1996:88). In that case, the thesis concerning their common 'sectarianism' is more probable but, of course, highly conjectural.

⁷⁹ Charlesworth (1996:81–85) distinguishes 15 common theological features between the Qumran community and the Johannine: dualism generally, dualism of flesh and spirit, predestination, pneumatology, realised eschatology, esoteric knowledge, salvific and eschatological 'living water', a united community, purity rules, Messianology and Christology, barriers of love, anonymity (no named authors, only general terms such as 'Righteous Teacher' and 'Beloved Disciple'), symbolic language (double entendre), a solar-lunar calendar, and some features that were probably common Jewish ideas (angels, temple criticism, the use of Isaiah in paradigmatic ways, etc.).

⁸⁰ Charlesworth is quite right when he argues that 'Once Qumran, or Essene, influence is obvious in ideological terms, it is imperative to perceive the influence of Qumran in sociological issues' (1996:80).

This chapter shall analyse the temple attitudes of the community from some core texts to test the replacement theory. It is no complete investigation. Of special interest is the role of the possible transferences presented in the Rule of the Community or Serek (1QS and the variants from other caves) in relation to statements in other texts (CD; 1QpHab et al.). A thorough examination of all these references has not been possible, but I have concentrated on *some* disputed and at the same time representative passages. Methodologically speaking, analysis of the Qumran writings has both advantages and disadvantages compared to the Gospel of John and Philo's writings. The Qumran writings are more reliable when it comes to originality and dating.⁸¹ John and his milieu are also more in the shadow than the originating milieu of the Qumran writings. There is a lot of information on sociographic issues such as the manner of organisation and patterns of behaviour in the Qumran writings (see also chapter 8 on the relationship towards 'outsiders' in Qumran), but the main social scientific method would still be analytical. Together with the new publications in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series and the publication of the collection of facsimiles of all the texts on microfiche (Tov 1993) as well as several new translations,⁸² the Qumran studies have simultaneously become both easier and more complex.⁸³

⁸¹ We have both palaeographical evidence and carbon 14-tests that allow us to conclude that they originated in the centuries before and after the start of the common area, cf. the reports in Bonani (1994) and Jull, D. Douglas, Broshi et al. (1995).

⁸² Concerning translations, see Martínez (1994) (translated from Spanish based on the Hebrew texts) and also Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997; 1998); Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996); Vermes (1975; 1995).

⁸³ On method, see P. Davies (1994:71). The methodological problems in the study of the Qumran writings have been characterised by the lack of coherence of the information from the scrolls themselves and the classical literature about the Essenes as well as by internal contradictions (both between the texts and the archaeological evidence and within the texts themselves), but particularly by the slow process of publication by those in charge of the texts (Vermes 1995:xx). The new deal in the publication politics of fragments from cave 4 led to a remarkable development of new theories and revisions of old solutions, which again has made it difficult for anyone to keep pace with all the new solutions.

5.3.2 *Temple References*

5.3.2.1 *Types of Temple References*

References to the temple and temple related issues in Qumran are of three kinds, similar to the structure of references in John and Philo. We find:

1. References to the geographical or temporal temple.
2. References to functions of the temple, sacrifice and worship.
3. References to a transferred temple and transferred related temple issues (the community as temple, the eschatological temple).

The ‘temple’ is mentioned several times in the core Qumran writings, and some writings, for instance the CD 9–16, demonstrate a serious concern for the dealings of this temple. Several of the fragments now released indicate that the authors were occupied with the eschatological idea of a new Jerusalem and a new temple.⁸⁴ It is, however, often difficult to know whether it is used symbolically or not. When the community or eschatological temple is not directly mentioned in the texts, we should be careful to infer too much about their alternative practice and neglect of the temple in the first century.

5.3.2.2 *References to the Jerusalem Temple*

Several scholars have concluded that the community had in principle rejected the temple, but they are primarily basing on the information in texts other than the Serek. Fiorenza (1976) used CD 20:22f about ‘the house of Peleg’ to conclude that the Yahad looked upon the whole temple as defiled, and Gärtner (1965:22) used CD 1:3ff (saying that God hid his face from Israel and from the sanctuary) to say that they thought God had abandoned the people and the temple. Ådna (1993:185, n. 170) points to the tension within the texts but he nevertheless concludes that the community radically turned away from the temple. Kampen (1999) argues that the temple in CD is primarily the eschatological temple because the community represented the only place where the Law could be observed.

⁸⁴ See the texts called ‘New Jerusalem’, 1Q32; 2Q24; 4Q554–5; 5Q15; 11Q18, see Martínez and Tigchelaar (1998:1111).

There are other scholars, however, that have objected to the conclusions saying that community was a completely segregated community. Stegemann (1992b:122–126) maintains that what the originators of the scrolls rejected was the altar offerings, not the votive offerings. This means that the temple was replaced by the community only in some respects. P. Davies (1996:48) also concludes that the members of the community had ceased their normal participation in the temple cultus, but not that the temple was rejected.

The texts referred to above, CD 1:3ff; 20:22 in addition to CD 5:6 are good examples of a negative attitude towards the Jerusalem temple. In CD 5:6, the defilement concerns the sexual cultic offences involving intercourse with menstruants, and it is difficult to see that this issue is so crucial that it made them neglect the temple, as P. Davies (1996:47–48) concludes. The other defilement text, CD 20:22b–24, seems more important for their overall view:

[...] from the house of Peleg, who left the holy city and leaned on God in the age of Israel's unfaithfulness; but defiled the temple and turned back to the path of the people in some things.

The lacuna in the middle of line 22 makes the meaning somewhat uncertain (see Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997:578). Apart from the difficulties to know what *בֵּית פֶּלֶג* ('house of Peleg') actually means (see P. Davies 1996:48), it is also difficult to know exactly the character of their defilement of the temple in the expression *וַיִּטְמְאוּ אֶת הַמִּקְדָּשׁ* ('but they defiled the temple'). Fiorenza (1976:164) translates parts of the sentence as 'Israel had sinned and made the temple unclean', but it is clearly not Israel per se that is the subject of the word 'defile' (*טָמַא*) but rather 'the house of Peleg' or 'those who do not serve him' (line 21), and those who have 'placed idols in their hearts', and 'have walked in the stubbornness of their heart' (line 9 and 10). The expression *בְּקֶץ מַעַל יִשְׂרָאֵל* 'in the age of Israel's unfaithfulness' (CD 20:23) may also point back to a limited period of time and therefore cannot be taken as a proof that they looked upon the temple as totally defiled. It probably reflects the protests during the reign of the Hasmoneans, the ruling priests from the Maccabean revolt to the Roman conquest in 63 BCE (Kampen 1999:193).

The defilement of the temple is also mentioned in CD 4:17 as one of the three nets of Belial (the Evil) in addition to fornication and wealth. Again this expression denoting 'defilement' seems to refer

to a limited lapse of time, an interpretation reinforced by the temporal expression in CD 4:12b 'and during all these years' **וּבְכָל הַשָּׁנִים הָאֵלֶּה**. Likewise, CD 1:3ff could be used to demonstrate the radical moving away from the temple:

For when they were unfaithful in forsaking him, he hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword. But when he remembered the covenant with the forefathers, he saved a remnant for Israel and did not deliver them up to destruction.

However, the 'remnant' (**שְׁאֵרִית**) mentioned here is also described as unfaithful, and those who were killed could no longer be responsible for the management of the temple. The passage may refer to a temporary defilement; it cannot be taken as an ongoing and final disapproval of the temple. Neither CD 20:22–23 nor 1:3ff are indisputable indications of the group's total rejection of the temple. The uncertainties in the manuscripts, combined with the difficulties in seeing the defilement as a sufficient cause to a permanent neglect or boycott of the temple, are essential arguments against the conclusion of a total rejection of the Jerusalem temple here.

In addition, the pro-temple statements in CD should generally warn us against interpreting the passages that are less pro-temple as being clear indications of a fundamental abrogation. In the second part of the CD, the offerings at the temple are presupposed. CD 12:8b–9 tells the reader that 'No-one should sell clean animals or birds, to the gentiles lest they sacrifice them', if the author does not refer to sacrifice within a Gentile cultus (see also chapter 8). CD 11:14–23, however, more directly refers to the Jerusalem temple, for instance when it strongly demands that 'no-one should send to the altar a sacrifice (etc.) by the hand of a man impure etc.' (11:18b–19). The testimonies of the CD indicate a criticism of the temple that applies alleged historical evidence as a witness (cf. the expression 'delivered by the sword' in CD 1:4a), but what is important is that the writing also is a regulation for the legal use of the temple, reflecting after all an ambivalent attitude.

We also find references to what apparently refers to the physical temple elsewhere in the core documents as the *peshar*-expositions to Habakkuk, clearly belonging to the Yahad (indicated in line 4: **עֲצַת הַיְּהָד**). The interpretation of 1QpHab 12:7b–10a refers to Hab 2:17 'owing to the blood of the city and the violence (against) the

country', making the 'city' refer to Jerusalem and the 'country' to the cities of Judah.⁸⁵ The sanctuary of Jerusalem is looked upon as defiled (טמא). According to one of the classical explanations of the origin of the Essenes and the Qumran community ('the Maccabean theory'), the view that the temple is defiled is somehow connected to a conflict caused by the Maccabean war (Vermes 1995:xvi, xxix). As was the case with the CD, these statements concerning the temple may be understood as a previous and temporary event.

1QS 8:13 is a passage that may be read as bearing witness to the construction of the Qumran community itself as a new temple and that the members isolated themselves from other Jews. The passage may at least indirectly refer to a conflict resulting in an exodus of a group of men: 'they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path'. The expression 'to walk to the desert' ללכת למדבר, could be taken as a proof of their physical isolation in Qumran. Esler (1994:79) argues, in accordance with the general theory by scholars like Gärtner and Klinzing, that the entire passage 1QS 8:1–16 demonstrates that the group functioned as a kind of an alternative temple, using 1QS 8:13 as a main proof that this split between the rest of Judaism and the new movement had even become irrevocable. However, even if read literally, the words 'wilderness' or 'desert' do not necessarily point towards a group in total isolation and there is nothing in this text indicating that they looked upon their community as an alternative that functioned socially independently. On the basis of the Serek and other core documents with references to the geographical temple in Jerusalem, there are few reasons to believe that the Yahad had initiated a full rejection and general neglect of this temple.

5.3.2.3 *References to Functions of the Temple*

P. Davies (1996:5) sees CD 11:17–18 in connection with CD 9:14; 12:1–2, and uses 16:1ff to demonstrate that several practices in CD point towards participation in the temple cultus.⁸⁶ These prescrip-

⁸⁵ 'Its interpretation: the city is Jerusalem in which the /Wicked/ Priest performed repulsive acts and defiled the Sanctuary of God. The violence (done to) the country are the cities of Judah which he plundered of the possessions of the poor.' For the text-critical marks like / /, see the explanations in Martínez (1997; 1998). See also Koester (1995:84, n. 23).

⁸⁶ CD 9:13–14 gives prescriptions about stolen goods in connection with the kind of offering that the priest was supposed to have; CD 12:1–2 warns against sexual intercourse in Jerusalem, and 16:6ff about private vows in the temple.

tions in CD indicate a serious concern for the purity of the temple. Deines (1994:73) uses the protests against the offerings to the emperor as early examples of the attitude also found later in the Jewish revolt (67 CE).

Some passages in CD are nevertheless quite negative towards sacrifices in the temple in general, and in CD central passages concerning the temple, 6:11b–14a; 11:17–21, even touch upon a direct rejection. CD 6:11b–14a says:

But all those who have been brought into the covenant shall not enter the temple to kindle his altar in vain. They will be the ones who close the door, as God said: 'Whoever amongst you will close my door so that you do not kindle my altar in vain'.

The passage does not, however, directly prohibit participation in temple activities. 'In vain' (חנם),⁸⁷ either means that they should not partake at all, or that they should do it only when in accordance with certain prescriptions. The quotation from Mal 1:10 in line 13 indicates that what is criticised, is not the temple per se, but the actual practice. Taking Malachi as model, the author finds a textual basis for his own protest.⁸⁸ O'Connor (1971) has demonstrated the difficulties in the translation, both grammatically and semantically in relation to the Malachi quotation. P. Davies (1996:54) criticises him for claiming that the covenant (ברית), is taken to be a unit that is departed from the covenant of the community apparent elsewhere in the CD; the covenant focused upon here is the whole community, he argues. He also claims that the only real difficulty here is the statement in CD 6:12b–14a, but he proposes that this statement represents a secondary gloss. This solution presupposes that the community later took an even more critical stance against the temple. Hempel (1997) points to the fact that this statement is also found in Qumran, see 4QD 3:3,⁸⁹ but as she maintains this in fact only demonstrates that the gloss originated earlier than the 4QD (Hempel 1997:121). It is interesting that P. Davies makes the expression לֹא אִם ('unless') refer to the first part of the cited text above and restores the text in the following way:

⁸⁷ 'Without compensation' (Gen 29:15), 'for nothing, in vain', (Ezek 6:10), 'without cause, undeservedly' (Isa 19:5), see Holladay (1988:100).

⁸⁸ Concerning vain offerings, Stegemann (1992b:122) uses 1QS, CD and 4QMMT to demonstrate the spiritual offerings of the Yahad.

⁸⁹ She writes 4QD^a but refers to 4QD^b, see the heading in Martínez (1994:51) with the same error.

And all who have entered the covenant: Are not to enter the sanctuary 'to light His altar in vain', unless they follow the observances of the law prescribed for the period of wickedness (1996:56),

a solution that is evidently more temple friendly.

A similar modifying expression as that found in CD 6 cited above, is found in CD 11:18: כִּי אֵם. This expression clearly limits the prohibition to certain sorts of sacrifices, no sacrifice *except* the Sabbath sacrifice.⁹⁰ Moreover, prayer, תפלה, may be presented as a parallel to sacrifice (CD 11:21); again, blood sacrifices themselves do not seem to be rejected in principle. CD 11:18–21 does not allow impure persons to take offerings to the temple; this is in accordance with what Josephus writes about the Essenes.

The very fragmented document Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QHalakhic Letter, MMT), has been used to demonstrate the exact issues of dissension between the Yaḥad and the priests responsible in the temple.⁹¹ The priests by birth most likely played a prominent role in the daily life of the group during its whole existence and were clearly declared to be different and had other functions than non-priests (Martínez 1999). 4QMMT mentions perhaps the offerings from Gentiles (4Q394, 3–7, 1), which is interesting because it would be difficult to read it symbolically. There are, however, several uncertainties concerning the subject at this point apart from the text-critical difficulties.⁹² On the other hand, in other passages 4QMMT portrays a traditional view on the Law that strengthens the impression of a loyal attitude.⁹³ Stegemann (1992b:122) points to the fact that some statements in 4QMMT render impure and unlawful every

⁹⁰ CD 11:17b–21 says: 'No-one should offer anything upon the altar on the sabbath, except the sacrifice of the sabbath, for thus it is written: 'except your offerings of the sabbath'. No-one should send to the altar a sacrifice, or an offering, or incense, or wood, by the hand of a man impure from any of the impurities, so allowing him to defile the altar, for it is written: 'the sacrifice of the wicked ones is an abomination, but the prayer of the just ones is like an agreeable offering'. Cf. Lev 23:38 and Prov 15:8.

⁹¹ According to Newsom (1990:170), this text is 'sectarian' and Qimron (Qimron and Strugnell 1994:175) concludes that the 'we'-group 'is clearly the Dead Sea Sect'. Martínez and Barrera (1995:92) take this document to be Qumranic according to his 'Groningen hypothesis' of the origin of the Qumran community, cf. Schiffman (1999).

⁹² See also Martínez and Tigchelaar (1998:1040ff) on 4Q513/4QOrdinances^b.

⁹³ Cf. 'and [...] remember the kings of Israel] and reflect on their deeds, how whoever of them was respecting [the La]w was freed from afflictions, etc.', 4Q398, 11–13, 6–7 (Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998:802ff).

cultic performance that is not based on the solar calendar. The manuscript indicates that the conflict between the authors and the temple (leaders) was mainly due to cultic disagreements in relation to the use of calendars.⁹⁴ Several texts confirm that the day begins in the morning, thus demonstrating the importance of the solar calendar. The re-discovery of a sundial in 1994 by Albani and Glessmer has also strengthened this impression (VanderKam 1998:89). CD 11:17–18 also suggests that the only feast the originators could celebrate together with other Jews in the temple was the Sabbath. Stegemann (1992b:124) concludes that

in late second temple times, the Essenes were the only Jews who refused to partake in the altar offerings, or in any other cultic performances, at the Jerusalem temple.

Together with several other scholars Strugnell (1994) now sees MMT as ‘pre-sectarian’ (cf. Kampen and Bernstein 1996). Martínez (1996:27) concludes that certain halakic struggles demonstrate at least a ‘pre-Qumranic setting’. If 4QMMT is to be taken as belonging to the same group that stood behind 1QS, it is therefore probable that potential cultic innovations indicated by the temple transferences came as a result of disagreement and not vice versa.⁹⁵

As in Philo, the paying of the temple tax turns out to be of vital interest for my sociological investigation of the Qumran community. As mentioned above, the paying of the tax is a very straight-forward indication of temple adherence and it has been argued earlier that the Qumran community opposed the institution of the temple tax (Liver 1963), but the latest publications of the fragments from cave 4 have demonstrated another attitude. 4QOrdinances (4Q159:1, 2,

⁹⁴ The first published scrolls manifested that the calendar question was essential (1QS 1:8–9, 13–15; 9:26–10:8, 13–14; CD 12:3–6; 16:2–4; 1QH 20:4–9) and the calendrical texts from cave 4 then confirmed this impression (VanderKam 1998:45–51, 71ff).

⁹⁵ Stegemann (1992b:108ff) also distinguishes four other significant peculiarities of the Qumran Essenes generally in comparison with other Jews at the time: the common meals, the purificatory ritual bath, the hierarchy and the admission of new members. These peculiarities are all part of their general attitude towards the mother religion and may all be looked upon as results of and not as causes of their deviance. According to VanderKam (1998:74ff) the community not only privileged a solar calendar, but also tried to bring it into harmony with the lunar system (much in accordance with 1 En. 72–82, and with the priestly courses established in 1 Chr 24:7–18), an argument for seeing the group as less isolating itself and therefore also less isolated.

6–7) in fact gives an indication that they paid their half-shekel as temple-tax once in their life-time to God (cf. Exod 30:11–16): ‘[Concern]ing [ransom:] the money of valuation which one gives as ransom for his own person will be half [a shekel,] only on[ce] will he give it in all his days (etc.)’ (Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997:309). The fragments of 4Q159 also refer to הַקֹּדֶשׁ (Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997:310), and would in that case further connect this fragment to the Jerusalem temple. If the emendation ‘corresponding to the shekel of the temple, as an offering to God’ (Martínez 1994:86) is correct, there is a high probability that they paid the tax to the temple in Jerusalem at some time. Moreover, in other Qumran passages it becomes evident that the members had been engaged in a debate on whether or not the daily sacrifice in the temple should be paid for by public funds (Baumgarten 1995:21). As stated above, the discussion in these Qumran writings demonstrates at least that they were concerned with the fate and management of the Jerusalem temple and not only the future temple in the Messianic age. The statement concerning the temple tax in Qumran also indicates that the relationship to the temple was not looked upon as settled.

The Qumran documents analysed do present a contradictory attitude towards the temple and related issues, an observation quite in accordance with the conclusion of P. Davies (1994). If these documents are taken to demonstrate a contemporary attitude of the Yaḥad in the first century, the conclusion is quite obvious. The temple is looked upon as defiled, at least once, but we do not have evidence for the thesis that they had rejected the temple totally, although their opposition cannot be disputed. The paying of the temple tax may, if it is characteristic for the Yaḥad, present the situation in a nutshell, adherence declared by the willingness to pay the temple tax, opposition in their reluctance to pay it.

A somewhat similar and whole-hearted critical attitude towards the temple tax is demonstrated by Philo, as argued above. A comparison between the Qumranites and the Philonic Alexandrians indicate, however, that the former were more reluctant in this matter, with a stricter opposition to the Jerusalem temple.

5.3.2.4 *References to Transferred Temple and Temple Issues*

The essential puzzle regarding the dispute with the temple institution in the Serek and of the members of the group referred to in

it, concerns the 'spiritualisation' theory.⁹⁶ The idea of transference in one way or the other generally makes all the references to the temple and temple issues insecure. Gärtner (1965:22) concluded that there is 'clear evidence for the idea of the community as a replacement for the official temple', a conclusion disputed today.⁹⁷ Nevertheless, most scholars seem to accept that the community to some extent did transfer some of the temple functions to the community.⁹⁸ Since Philo's writings demonstrate a temple transference that does not necessarily indicate a neglect of the temple institution, we shall have to investigate further to see if there are indications of a rejection or replacement of the temple or any temple functions in the Qumran writings that go beyond the mere transference.

In the Serek (1QS), there are several passages that may explain the relationship between the group and the Jerusalem temple.⁹⁹ The most interesting one from my point of view is 1QS 8:4b–7a:

When these things exist in Israel the Community council shall be founded on truth, to be an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for the judgement and chosen by the will (of God) to atone for the land and to render the wicked their retribution.

It is particularly the expressions *בית קודש לישראל* 'a holy house for Israel', *קודש קודשים* 'holy of holies', and 'atone for the land' *לכפר בעד הארץ*, that indicate transferences of the temple to practices in the congregation of the Qumran community.

There are several problems with the understanding of the passage apart from the right understanding of the metaphors like 'holy house'. The first line may be translated as 'when these exist in Israel' and not necessarily as in Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:89) with 'things' because the *אלה* here may also refer to 'men' (masculine plural). Klinzing (1971:55) argues that the reference must be neutral and

⁹⁶ This notion has been advocated in connection with Qumran writings and other writings by scholars like Wenschkewitz (1932), McKelvey (1969), and Gärtner (1965). See also the discussion above.

⁹⁷ See the discussion in Klinzing (1971:91).

⁹⁸ See the discussion in the updated Schürer (1986:582); Stegemann (1992b:134); Adna (1993:188).

⁹⁹ Gärtner (1965) and Klinzing (1971) have focused on three particular passages of 1QS where a transference ('Umdeutung' or 'spiritualisation') occurs, 1QS 5:4ff; 9:3ff; 8:4ff. In addition, Klinzing (1971) also analyses 1QS 11:8.

refers to ‘things’. In that case, it refers perhaps to the ‘things’ mentioned in the previous lines. The manifesto, ‘when these things exist’, also found in 8:14; 9:13, seems to be introduced rather abruptly here (Metso 1993), a fact that weakens an argument from context.¹⁰⁰ In line 5, it is not the community as such that is in focus, but the council *עצת הייחוד*. If the Rule is a rule for several communities, the passage perhaps then refers to the procedures for the establishment of new groups.

Gärtner (1965:23) argues that the Qumran community occupied the same position for the member of the community as the Jerusalem temple did for Israel, an interpretation that straightens the replacement thesis. Gärtner (1965:26) rightly points to the fact that there are a number of themes in this passage that are connected to the symbolism of the temple, and Klinzing (1971:60) very well argues that the ‘plantation’ is the community. However, in the whole passage there are no clear indications of a total rejection or replacement of the temple in Jerusalem within such a claim. 1QS 5:5 reports a transference of the member’s circumcision to ‘his tendency and his stiff neck’. The possible transference of the circumcision lies outside the scope of this investigation, but it is hard to believe that this transference indicates an abrogation of the prescription; an argument that strengthens the hypothesis that transferences generally in core Qumran writings cannot immediately be taken to reflect abrogation or complete neglect.

In 4QFlor, there is a possible transference of the temple to a body of persons, ‘And he commanded to build for himself a temple of man, to offer him in it, before him the works of thanksgiving’.¹⁰¹ The central expression here *miqdash adam*—מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם (‘temple of man’ or ‘temple by man’), is much discussed. Does it, for instance, refer to a temple made by and for man or consisting of man and what is the status of this temple? This ambiguity of the expression itself and its near context makes it almost useless in an evaluation of temple relationship and attitudes in the group behind it. Brooke

¹⁰⁰ Metso (1993; 2004) demonstrates the difficulties in reconstructing history by literary critical analysis of the Serek.

¹⁰¹ Or ‘the works of law’, תּוֹרָה or תּוֹרָה, the reading is dubious (ד or ר) in 4QFlor (4Q174) 1,1: 2:6a–7b (Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997:352–354), see Knibb (1987:260). The reading with *daleth* now seems to be the preferred one (Brooke 1999c:288, n. 13).

(1985:354) stresses the ambiguity of the terms in connection with the community and the sanctuary in 4QFlor, 'the community understood itself as being the eschatological sanctuary in anticipation'.¹⁰² Wise (1991) argues that there are two temple references in the passage. Dimant (1986) argues that 4QFlor operates with three different kinds of temples, the eschatological, the geographical, and the human. The expression *הבית* (the house) in line 2 and 3 is the eschatological temple, *מקדש* (temple) in line 6a is the geographical, and *מקדש אדם* (temple of/by man) in line 6b is the human. The eschatological temple is perhaps also the reference in the Temple Scroll 11Q19 29:9–10, but the status of the scroll, as mentioned in chapter 3, is uncertain as a product of the Yahad (Stegemann (1992a:181). The reference to three different temples is probable in 4QFlor 1, 1:1–7a, but the status of the last temple in relation to the present is nevertheless not stated. Brooke (1999c) concludes that the community could function without a temple because of its eschatological self-understanding.

The expression 'temple of man' could probably just as well refer to a physical temple building. If it is taken to refer to a transferred temple, e.g. to a group of men like the community, it is worthwhile to notice that it says nothing about the relations between the temples. The manuscript is highly fragmentary and can only be properly understood in relation to other more certain texts. Again, criticism and transference of the temple and temple related issues must not be confused with a total rejection or neglect, when such a rejection or neglect is not mentioned in the texts themselves.

5.3.3 *The Ambiguities of 1QS 9:3ff*

One of the few passages that in fact could demonstrate a rejection of the Jerusalem temple is 1QS 9:3ff. The reason is that in this passage we find both the replaced entity and the replacer, in addition to a possible indication of a replacement. The passage may be taken to refer to an establishment of an independent temple in relation to the temple in Jerusalem. However, the ambiguities in the passage make the sociological conclusions of the passage very uncertain.

¹⁰² Regarding the eschatological temple, see Deines (1994) and Brooke (1985:80ff). See also the discussion in Ådna (2000:91–110; cf. 25–89) on the understanding and use of Exod 15:17b, 18.

The understanding of the Hebrew phrase ‘from or without flesh of burnt offerings’ (line 4) is crucial for the understanding of the passage. Transcribed with vowels and marks, the text is presented like this (from Lohse 1971:25):

מִבֶּשֶׂר עוֹלוֹת וּמִחֻלֵּי זֶבַח ' וְתְרוּמַת 5 שְׁפָתַיִם לְמִשְׁפָּט . . .

The sentence has been read both in an *inclusive* and in an *exclusive* way in relation to the temple adherence question. Lohse (1971:33) translates, ‘mehr als Fleisch von Brandopfern und Fett von Schlachtopfern: das Heboffer der Lippen nach der Vorschrift . . .’. Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:91) translate, ‘without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice—the offering of the lips in compliance with the decree etc’. The difference between ‘more than’ and ‘without’ in these translations is indicative for the general problems involved here.

The passage is also difficult for two technical reasons that also disturb the first impression of a clear replacement involved: the hand of 1QS does not differ between waw and yod, and the last group of letters in line 4 contains a contraction which is difficult to reproduce in a printed text like this, but consists of a combination of תְּרוּמַת and זֶבַח with a waw or yod in between them. The combination of the uncertain letter and a contraction of words has given several different translations, but no certain conclusion regarding the reading may be drawn from the photographs or the original manuscript.¹⁰³

There are two main solutions to this technical problem: 1. זֶבַח is read as plural constructus with a ' linking the offerings of the flesh to the following notion of offering of lips (prayers), תְּרוּמַת שְׁפָתַיִם.¹⁰⁴ 2. זֶבַח is read as singular and the ׁ as introducing a new section.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ In accordance with the observations by Klinzing (1971:38, n. 101). Carmignac and Guilbert (1961:62) argued that a waw between the words is more probable than a yod. The photography of this passage (Burrows 1951; Tov 1993) shows the difficulties quite clearly. I have had the opportunity to consult the original manuscript in the Shrine of the Book of the Israel Museum, Jerusalem, a consultation that confirmed this impression.

¹⁰⁴ See Milik (1951:151); Wernberg-Møller (1957:35); Beall (1988:115); Schmidt (1994:298).

¹⁰⁵ See Lohse (1971:32–33) and Martínez (1994:13); Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:91). Charlesworth (1994) translates זֶבַח with ‘without’, and seems to keep the '

Klinzing argues that the end of line 4 contains a scribal error (haplography from the preceding word עֹלֹת) and that one should read the word as plural ('the fats of sacrifices'). In the fragments of the Serek from cave 4, the word מִזֵּי as seen in 1QS and that is connected to חֶלֶב, is lacking and there is a lacuna where בֶּשֶׂר or מִבֶּשֶׂר is presumed.¹⁰⁶ The three offerings, the burnt offering, the fats of sacrifice and the offering of the lips, may then be read co-ordinated. In addition, זֶבַח has a different ending in the fragment (now plural absolutus) that strengthens the impression of a short stop before תְּרוֹמַת also in 1QS 9. This indicates at least that the ם or ך in the middle of the contraction seen in 1QS 9 should be looked upon as a mark of conjunction and does not belong to the preceding word זֶבַח.¹⁰⁷ The problems in establishing a fixed text for transcription and translation are obvious.

However, the main problem with the passage is the preposition מִן (1QS 9:4b) in combination with the total expression. The word is rendered differently by various translators:

1. To express rejection, i.e. 'without' by Martínez (1994:13); Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:91); Knibb (1987:138); Vermes (1995:74); Charlesworth (1994:39). Dupont-Sommer and Philonenko use 'sans' (1987:34), and Klinzing (1971:38) 'ohne'.¹⁰⁸
2. To express an instrumental function, i.e. 'by means of', Wernberg-Møller (1957:35) or 'grâce à', Carmignac and Guilbert (1961:60).
3. To express a comparison, i.e. 'more than', in E. Nielsen and Otzen (1959:85), Pouilly (1976:128) 'plus que' and Lohss (1971:25) uses 'mehr als'.

with the זֶבַח and at the same time starts a new sentence at תְּרוֹמַת, 'without the flesh of burnt-offerings and without the fat of sacrifices. The proper offerings of the lips . . . '.

¹⁰⁶ On the 4QRule of the Community, fragment numbered 4Q258, line 5, see the photocopy of PAM 43.246 from Tov (1993) and Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:522).

¹⁰⁷ This is in accordance with the translation in Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:522–523) where תְּרוֹמַת in the translation of 4Q258, 2, 2:4b–5 (4QS^d) starts a new section reading 'in order to atone for the guilt of iniquity [and for the unfaithfulness of s]n and for approval for the ear[th without the flesh] of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice—the offerings and the free-will offering of the lips in compliance with the decree will be like a pleasant aroma.'

¹⁰⁸ Klinzing (1971:39–40) analyses the options and concludes that 'ohne' is the only possibility, particularly against the background of its use and meaning in Hos 6:6 (but see below).

These translations of the word reflect its wide range of meanings in biblical Hebrew. The word is *inter alia* used to form a comparison (cf. Kautzsch and Cowley 1966:§133) where the original meaning seems to have been that of ‘separation’ or ‘motion away from’ (Kautzsch and Cowley 1966:§119v–z).¹⁰⁹ In biblical Hebrew, the meaning ‘without’ is also found in Num 15:24. The meaning of the word in Qumran writings is, on the other hand, uncertain, but would be significant, not only for this passage, but also for the entire understanding of the relationship between the community and the temple.

The meaning of the preposition in similar constructions is not attested outside the Serek. In the biblical texts, some parallels may be found, however, but none of the meanings listed in Koehler and Baumgartner (1958) are identical. The only biblical expression similar to it is Hos 6:6b:

כִּי חֶסֶד חִפְצָתִי וְלֹא זֶבַח וְדַעַת אֱלֹהִים מַעֲלֹוֹת

‘for I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God and not burnt offerings’, see Klinzing (1971:40). NRSV (1993) translates, ‘and the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings’, presenting it as a comparison. In Kautzsch and Cowley (1966:§119w), the authors of the grammar argue that מִן here is to be translated as the לֹא of the first half-verse. Nevertheless, the biblical context is not similar to the context in the Qumran text, and we must be aware of a certain ambiguity in the expression here. Both the comparative meaning and the privative meaning are nevertheless possible, and the understanding of the whole sentence in combination with בָּשָׂר and הָלֵב in 1QS 9:4 therefore will remain relative to our comprehension of the key term מִן: ‘without’ or ‘more than’.

If we use ‘without’, the sentence favours an interpretation saying that members of the community neglected the offerings in the Jerusalem temple and had established their own transferred (‘spiritual’) offering, looked upon as an adequate solution. If we translate it with ‘more than, better than’, it may refer to members that accepted the offerings in the Jerusalem temple in some way, but still looked upon their own transferred (‘spiritual’) offerings as better, generally or temporarily

¹⁰⁹ Qimron does not mention the problem of the meaning of this preposition in his *Dead Sea Scrolls Hebrew grammar* (1986).

in their specific situation only. To conclude, as Gärtner, that the passage demonstrates that the community had 'replaced' the burnt offerings and the sacrifices of the Jerusalem temple by 'prayers and the perfect life according to the Law' has some, but little support in the text.

5.3.4 *Purificatory After All*

Through their self-presentation in some of the core documents, the alleged Qumran group not only presents itself and its positions regarding various questions, but it also presents positions that the members were attacking. As pointed out, at the centre of dispute seem to lie questions concerning the temple of Jerusalem with its priests and its temple cultus. In some instances, the texts attest that the authors looked upon the temple as defiled, but the investigation supports theories saying that there are few reasons to believe that the Qumran community had established animal sacrifices as a replacement of the cultus in Jerusalem. It is also difficult to judge whether they had completely rejected the temple or not. Both prayer as sacrifice and the community as temple, are transferences that may function both as substitute and supplement.

There are indications that they could have been paying the temple tax at some time during the history of the community. Likewise, the temple passages in the Serek may be interpreted as an expression of ambivalence towards the temple of Jerusalem. Each temple-passage in the Serek may be interpreted in two or three ways concerning the relationship towards the temple:

1. The texts uncover a protest from an isolated group,
2. the texts uncover a protest from a group still in touch with the parent body, and
3. the texts uncover a protest from a group also living integrated in the overall society.

I shall argue that, based on the Serek, the second alternative seems to be the most probable solution. This is much in accordance with the results from Qumran scholars like Stegemann (1992b; 1994) and P. Davies (1996) and should not necessarily be looked upon as competitive to the more radical views, presented by scholars like Martínez (1999) and Schiffman (1999). My investigation supports the theories

claiming that the group behind the Qumran writings (at least behind 1QS) was less separated than traditional solutions claim, simply because the tracks of complete isolation, segregation and replacement are not unambiguously presented in the texts. In relation to the theories of P. Davies on the relationship of the group behind CD, my analysis suggests a similar ambivalence towards the temple Judaism in 1QS. While P. Davies argues for the claim by saying that the most negative statements concerning the temple are glosses, my solution concerning 1QS takes another path, and again I think the comparison with the Philonic evidence makes another solution not only possible, but probable too. In the scholarly analysis of the relationship between John and Qumran and between Qumran and Philo, this similarity has previously not been properly recognised.¹¹⁰

5.4 JOHN, PHILO, QUMRAN AND THE TEMPLE IN COMPARISON

We find similar temple issues in the Gospel of John, the writings of Philo and the core Qumran documents from the Yaḥad. There are references to the geographical temple itself and temple related issues such as different kinds of worship. The geographical temple and the temple issues are transferred to other areas, although not in the same meaning, way, or degree. Nevertheless, we do find similar kinds of transferences that might in some cases have threatened even the status of the temple institution.

One problem in a comparison like this is to avoid ‘parallelomania’ (Sandmel 1962). In relation to my study, it means that we must not only register parallel concepts and issues between John, Philo, and Qumran concerning the temple, but we must also be able to demonstrate if and how these parallels may help us to understand the Gospel and the social situation of its community. One of the main results from my comparison is that there is a common pattern of ideas and expressed attitudes that reflect a similar relationship to the temple in these text-corpora. Philo is an example of a Diaspora Jew who functioned within Jerusalem temple Judaism at large, although he, together with several of the Alexandrian Jews, struggled with the fact that the local Jewish community was a political and religious

¹¹⁰ See the discussions in Quispel (1972); Charlesworth (1991c; 1993; 1996); Price (1990).

minority in its Alexandrian setting. The Qumran community formed a minority group protesting in a way that went much further in rejecting the temple. The Johannine Gospel also demonstrates a minority group setting with some temple transferences possibly reflecting a replacement of the temple institution. The reasons are, however, vague. The conclusion that the Qumran community or congregation was looked upon as a temple, can hardly be questioned. This is evident not only in 1QS but also in other core writings, such as CD and 1QpHab. Similar concepts of a group being a temple are also witnessed by Philo (e.g. Israel as temple) and in the New Testament (e.g. congregation or community as temple), but not in the Gospel of John. The Fourth Gospel *only* tells us that the body of Jesus was looked upon as a temple, that the temple was destroyed and that a new kind of worship had taken its place. To conclude that this parallel gives little insight and is a result of 'parallelomania' would, however, be too hasty a conclusion. The common pattern of temple attitudes may, in fact, help us in our understanding of the Gospel of John and our understanding of how the difference, antagonism and separation that I have found are to be sociologically evaluated (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:49).

As stated earlier, a comparison between Philo and John regarding these matters does not imply that John knew Philo or his writings, although it is most interesting that the oldest extant fragment of the Gospel was found in Egypt.¹¹¹ The fact that Philo's writings were preserved by Christians and had great influence on the early church (Runia 1993a:78) urges one at least to try to discover reasons for this influence, but that is another task. There are no reasons to believe that Philo knew the Qumran writings either. However, Philo and Qumran may be used to discover the probable alternative choices in a fairly similar historical situation. Although Philo is judged to have been a loyal Jew in regard to the temple, the Philonic criticism of the temple is in some ways comparable to the severe protests found in Qumran. He demonstrates how far a loyal Jew could go without being disloyal.

Philo and John have been compared in many ways, but to my knowledge, no one has yet used Philo as background material for a

¹¹¹ Cf. P⁵² in John Ryland Papyrus 457 of Jn 18:31–34, its date is about 135, see Brown (1997:50).

comparison of social characteristics of the Gospel of John.¹¹² References to Philo are common in commentaries on the Gospel of John concerning John's ideas of a transferred temple. Lindars (1972:144) rightly points to the fact that the idea of a temple is often employed in religious writings 'as a metaphor for the body' and refers to Philo (Opif. 136–137) and Paul (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19). He concludes that the metaphor in this connection does not have any 'generalized sense', which means that the 'body' is a re-writing of 'temple' and thus 'there is no hint of further related ideas'—such as those found in Philo. Barrett (1978:201) brings in more nuances when he argues that Philo's use of the idea is quite different from the one in John. He points to a similar significance of the temple in Philo's writings, for example passages like Opif. 137 that compares the first man with a holy shrine for the reasonable soul. Likewise, Somn. 1:14 says that the soul itself is the house of God, and Ebr. 101 that the body is the prison of the soul (see my comments above). Barrett (1978:201) argues that Philo's conception of the body as temple is quite different from John's 'since it [John's conception] rests not upon general observations or speculations about the relation of the human soul to God but upon the unique mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son (14:10).' In connection with Jn 4:24, Barrett (1978:238) also points to the fact that the Hellenistic language of τὸ πνεῦμα was taken over by Philo and refers to Opif. 8 in which Philo declares that nature consists of two parts, one part the active cause (τὸ δραστήριον αἷτιον), and the other the passive object (τὸ παθητόν), and that the active cause is the mind (ὁ νοῦς). However, Barrett does not explore this possibility further in connection with the question of the Johannine attitudes towards temple Judaism. He is right when he claims that the mutual indwelling of the Father and the Son is particular to the Johannine presentation of Jesus and without parallels in Philo. However, Philo has a broad spectrum of conceptions concerning the temple and he often presents his ideas on the relationship between the

¹¹² On Philo and the Gospel of John, see Daniélou (1958:204ff); Borgen (1965); Sandmel (1984:40–41); Runia (1993a:78ff). Scholars like Loisy (see Charlesworth 1996:65) and Dodd (1953:73) have argued that there was a direct line between Philo and the author of the Gospel of John. Borgen (1996a:99) probably states the present consensus very well when he declares that Philo may exemplify Jewish traditions and thought-categories that are interpreted along different lines by him and John.

temple, geographically located in Jerusalem and the transference of temple ideas to other areas, such as a congregation, the soul, and the universe.

Many scholars, e.g. Martyn (1968; 1979) and Pancaro (1975), have pointed to the christological debates as a bone of contention between the Johannine community and 'the Jews'. Others, like Brown (1978:11) have argued that 'there is a second major point of contention, namely, *the Jewish cult*' (italics mine), and Brown claims that 'the most sacred cultic institutions of Judaism have lost their significance for those who believe in Jesus' (1978:11).¹¹³ As I pointed out in the previous chapter, Barrett (1978:201) concludes that Jesus became the only true temple. The evidence of Philo may further generally dissolve this replacement theory for us. There are two ways that passages from Philo may be applied to help the understanding of the temple relationship in the Gospel of John:

1. By referring to the same temple aspects seen in John (temple, temple transferences and temple related issues) Philo presents a general Diaspora Jewish background of the temple ideas in John.
2. By demonstrating that the temple criticism and transference we see in John were shared by other Jews, Philo also provides a general background for temple discussions among Jews at the time.

The formal similarities of the Philonic position towards the temple institution compared to the Johannine are in fact striking. Philo includes references both to geographical temples and to transferred temples, to actual worship and transferred worship, similarly to the two temple passages in John that I have studied. John also employs a conception of a transferred temple by referring to the body of Jesus as a temple, and he refers to the geographical temple in the cleansing proper as well as in reporting the Jewish misunderstandings concerning the statements of Jesus that leads him to transference comments by the author (Jn 2:21). In Jn 4, the reference to

¹¹³ See my comments and the entire quote in chapter 4. Brown mentions here three arguments in support of his view, 1. Jesus is now the place of the divine tabernacle (1:14), 2. the body of Jesus is the temple (2:21) and 3. Jesus systematically replaces the significance of Sabbath, Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication.

the geographical temple is indicated in Jn 4:21, while Jn 4:23–24 refers to a transferred temple worship. Since the way of looking at, reflecting and transferring the temple is similar in these writings this observation strengthens a more substantial and sociological way of comparison and leads us to ask whether the situation of the Philo community may explain the situation of the Johannine community and even of the Qumran community.

The essential result of my comparison between John and Philo on this matter is that they express a similarity of temple discussion and ways of transference of the temple to hypostatic entities. These entities are represented as temples both in Philo and in John. In the Gospel of John, it is presented by the body of Jesus, in Philo by several images of the temple such as body, soul, congregation, and cosmos. In addition to these similarities, they both express corresponding temple ambivalence. On the one hand, we see neglect or even almost rejection of the temple, and on the other hand, practical adherence to the temple. In John, the opposition is particularly presented in the story of the temple cleansing and in Jesus' dialogue with the Samaritan woman on the proper temple place and manner of worship. In Philo, it is evident by the rejection of the need of temple buildings and transferences of the temple and sacrifices. Philo and John present a corresponding practice, a common tension between the temporal temple and the transferred temple and consequently also possible corresponding solutions.

However, there are some differences between Philo and John concerning the temple not mentioned by Barrett that have to be considered and that turn out to be of vital interest. Both Philo and John are temple-oriented and operate with temple transferences of different kinds. Philo stresses the fact that the temple is an image of the ideal temple, that the cosmos is a temple etc. Despite his transferences, he underlines the necessity of the Jerusalem temple and of observing the ordinances of the Law. In some passages, he seems to totally reject the temple made of stones, including its offerings, worship and sacrifices. In other passages, he underlines the significance of the Jerusalem temple as well as the sacrifices. Contrary to the presentation of the attitude towards the temple in the Gospel of John, Philo never leaves us in doubt about his *tertium comparationis*. The observable phenomenon, the Jerusalem temple, and the observation of the Law generally in Philo, are in fact necessary points of departure for knowledge of God. The contradiction between the transferred tem-

ple of heaven and of soul on the one hand, and the concrete Jerusalem temple on the other is in this way partly dissolved. Although Philo rejected other temples generally in the same way as he rejects the Jerusalem temple as the true abode of God, he never rejects the Jerusalem temple for the same reasons as he rejects the other temples. The temple is in one way rejected but it is never neglected. In John, the logic and reason for the transference are not stated as clearly as in Philo and we are left in doubt about its meaning and the degree of tension involved when John formulates such transferences. When comparing the temple relationship in Philo with John, we nevertheless see that the position expressed by Philo is significant for our understanding of the temple relationship modelled in John. In fact, in some passages (Plant. 126; Spec. 1:84–97; Her. 76; Cher. 98–101; Somn. 2:250) Philo rejects the Jerusalem temple in a much more categorical way than John does. At the same time, it is clear that neither Philo nor his fellow Alexandrian Jews ever rejected and neglected the temple in practice in the same way as did the extreme or neglecting allegorists according to Migr. 89–93.

Although we cannot presume contact between the Alexandrian and the Johannine milieu, the Alexandrian example demonstrates that the negative attitude also found in John concerning the temple and the worship does *not* necessarily result in a rejection of the temple or a negligence, despite the other substantial differences and despite the fact that the community had experienced the destruction of the temple buildings. In addition, the Philonic example also urges us to reassess the Qumran evidence concerning the temple relationship.

We do not know the exact locale of the Johannine community, but for that reason we cannot exclude the possibility that the protest reported in the Gospel against the temple was part of a relational social pattern that is in accordance with a pattern also found in Qumran writings (the Qumran community) in Philo's writings and therefore also in the Jewish milieu one might call 'the Philo community'. There is a formal resemblance between the Johannine attitude towards the temple and the Philonic attitude: the two have in common the transferences concerning the temple. Our knowledge of Philo, his doctrines, traditions and his locale, are much more detailed than our knowledge of similar aspects of John. The Philonic evidence well explains the ambiguity in the Johannine community and makes us see that it is not necessarily evidence of a rejection of the

temple institution. Even the Qumran evidence is not conclusive in this matter. The result from my analysis of both Philo and Qumran texts concerning the temple should warn us against too simple conclusions regarding the temple relationship in the Gospel of John.

In Jn 2, the Gospel presents its idea of the body of Jesus as a temple (2:21). In Jn 4, it is said that there is another worship, a worship 'in spirit and truth' (4:23–24) and a combination of the evidence in Jn 2 and 4 may reflect an attitude that the community behind the Gospel no longer saw the Jerusalem temple as a particular place of worship since the body of Jesus had satisfactorily replaced it. However, in Philo a much more radical refusal of the Jerusalem temple does not represent a neglect of the temple, a fact strengthening the hypothesis of a Johannine community within temple Judaism and strengthening the tendency in recent Johannine scholarship to accept the Jewishness of the Fourth Gospel.

The basic relational temple models from Jn 2 and 4 (see chapter 4) were: 1. A rejection model, 2. an acceptance model, and 3. a conjunction model. These models may now also be applied to my discussion of the position of Philo towards temple Judaism. The position of Philo is clearly that of conjunction, in some passages he presents statements that leave little room for temple worship in Jerusalem, while in others he states that he does not support any neglect of the traditional observation. In Jn 2:13–22, I found evidence for a relationship that is best described by what I called the 'acceptance model'. Although criticising the temple, it does not present any break in principle or neglect in practice of the temple. The story of the Samaritan encounter in Jn 4 in combination with the story of the temple cleansing in Jn 2, however, indicates that the transference of the traditional and geographically located worship to a worship 'in spirit and truth', reflects a 'rejection model', i.e. a high-tension relationship with a break both in principle and in practice (neglect).

When comparing the results of the analysis of Jn 2 and 4 with the analysis of temple references in Philo, I shall now have to *reconsider* my earlier conclusion. What Philo has demonstrated is that first century Judaism may operate with several different temple transferences and even a fundamental rejection of the temple that does not imply a neglect of the temple and its many functions. This is sociologically important. Against this background, I have established arguments indicating that John's statements reflect practices that

accord with the 'conjunction' model as well and not a 'rejection', which means less social tension.

The evidence from the writings of Philo points to the possibility of the same author or milieu accepting it in practise and rejecting it in principle at the same time, which does not mean neglecting it. The statements in 1QS concerning the temple may reflect a similar dual attitude although the main impression is very harsh criticism. Similarly to John, we do not find Philo's solution to the dilemma between geographical and transferred items in 1QS. It is difficult to know what kind of relationship this attitude reveals—total rejection or part rejection. Despite the differences in the protests against the temple institution, the Philonic evidence opens up for seeing both the Qumran community and the Johannine community as part of the parent body.

Even if it could be said that the Qumran community as other groups at the time had inherited old patterns of protest (Schmidt 1994; Lemche 1996, 1998) they had probably also created some new institutions with parallel functions. Without taking a stance in the discussion of the historical genesis of the protest, we may nevertheless conclude that the negative attitude towards the Jerusalem temple originated in a protest against what some looked upon as a cultic defilement. These new institutions within the community came *as a result* of a reaction against the existing cultus at the temple in Jerusalem; particularly the calendar was a key issue in the conflict. The strict membership criteria, revealed for instance in the Serek, may be interpreted as a protest against less strict practice in purity issues at the Jerusalem temple—at least at a certain period in the history of the community. As far as we know, Philo's attitude did not lead to any institutionalised innovations of the temple functions. We know far too little about the Therapeutae from Philo's *De vita contemplativa* to draw definite conclusions about the existence of this group or about the rituals its members practised. This difference would in that case indicate only a difference in degree between the Philonic and the Qumran objections to the temple.

The detached attitude of the Johannine community in Jn 4 towards cultic places could, on the other hand, be regarded as a new institutionalised practice based on the understanding of Jesus as a temple much in a formal resemblance with the witnesses from the Qumran community. This transferred temple activity seems to have

been different from the one found in the Qumran community as indicated in 1QS, contra Gärtner (1965), but much in accordance with Klinzing (1971:212–213). This kind of protest is found neither in Philo nor in John. The degree of social tension due to temple issues must therefore have been greater in the community behind Qumran writings than in the communities behind the Gospel of John and behind Philo, and greater in the Johannine community than in the Philo community.

Both Philo, with his strong refusal of the temple as a proper abode of God in connection with his temple adherence, and the Qumran community, with its severe protest against the defilement of the temple and its isolation, indicate that the *conjunction* model was not only a possible model but even suggests that it was a common one in the first century. It is therefore also a probable model for our understanding of the Johannine community in this matter. The evidence from Philo and Qumran strengthens the theory that the temple idea was hard to abandon and that the temple institution was mostly supported at the end. This means above all that we are *not* forced to say that the Johannine community with its temple attitudes resembles the Qumran community in opposition to the Philo community. Both the Qumran evidence and Philonic evidence force us to reconsider the conclusion that the statements in the Gospel of John necessarily reflect a situation where the Johannine community was a high-tension group in relation to the temple institution (with or without temple buildings). The fact that the Philonic writings demonstrate that Philo, and probably several Alexandrian Jews, observed the Law in these matters, along with the fact that they thereby supported the temple institution, is *more important* than the fact that Philo in many passages reduces the significance of the physical buildings and related issues.

Against the background of Philo and the Qumran writings studied above, we cannot conclude that rejection and expressions of replacement are equivalents to a neglect of the traditional temple institution. The Jewish setting of the Gospel of John is in this way reinforced. In fact, the criticism of the temple is more explicit and fundamental of character in Philo and Qumran than in John. Expressions of rejection and replacement do not mean that all groups were extremely high-tension groups in this temple matter. We find tension in the Gospel of John as well, but the degree of tension can, against the background of Philo and Qumran writings, no longer be

seen as necessarily high. The comparison with Philo and Qumran makes the impression of a high degree of temple tension quite relative. In light of the temple passages in Jn 2 and 4, the 'conjunction model' is a more suitable model to describe the temple relationship of the community both at the time when the Gospel was written down and earlier. In that case, it is fair to say that if the temple buildings had not been destroyed, the Jewish members of the Johannine community would probably not have been neglecting the temple worship and celebration. In light of the Philonic evidence, the statements in the Gospel of John concerning the temple are completely understandable as statements from a loyal temple group. The Johannine community was rooted in temple Judaism, an institution that was not easily disregarded with its multiple functions.

This picture must now be considered in light of other relevant statements in the Gospel concerning the temple, temple-related festivals and functions as well as other areas of tension.

CHAPTER SIX

TEMPLE-RELATED FESTIVALS IN JOHN

6.1 THE TEMPLE APPROACH

It is important to notice that this chapter has a broad scope, but a limited focus. There are several aspects of each passage studied that are not interesting from my point of view. Particularly in focus are the statements that reflect a relationship between temple-related features attributed to Jesus and the actual temple-related objects themselves. We may call aspects of these expressions ‘relational aspects’—aspects that may inform us about the potential tension vis-à-vis the temple institution in the community, too.

As stated in chapter 4, it is difficult to reconstruct historically the exact situation and ritual procedures in and around the temple in the late second temple period because of the lack of appropriate sources. From archaeological findings, Old Testament/Tanak, Josephus, Philo, rabbinical writings, and other writings from the period it is possible to partly reconstruct some of the contents and functions of the temple festivals at the time.¹ Against this background, it may be helpful to evaluate the replacement involved in John and its social consequences, but only to a certain degree, as we do not know for certain that John refers to institutions in accordance with this information. The primary source for investigating a possible replacement strategy of institutions in John is the temple-related issues referred to and treated in the Gospel itself. The degree of replacement involved will therefore be based upon an internal evaluation of the Johannine testimony first and then compared to testimonies of the other writings included in this investigation; its degree of tension may then be relatively determined on that basis.

The essential festivals celebrated at the temple in the first century CE also reported by John, are the *Passover* (τὸ πάσχα) and the festival of *Dedication* (τὰ ἐγκαινία). We find Johannine references to three

¹ Examples are possible historical reconstructions of the festival of Booths on the basis of Lev 23:33ff and m. Sukkah. See Ulfsgard (1989).

distinct Passover festivals during the story of the ministry of Jesus, the first one in Jn 2:13 and 2:23, the second one in Jn 6:4, and the third one in Jn 11ff (11:55; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14). The festival of Dedication is the backdrop of the story in 10:22ff. The temple is mentioned by John in connection with all these passages, with the exception of Jn 6. Other stories concerning festivals and celebrated feasts are also temple-related in some way in the Gospel, although not exclusively attached to these. The celebrations of the Sabbath reported in Jn 5 and 7 (5:9, 10, 16, 18; 7:22–23) have a temple background, while the mentioning of the Sabbath in Jn 9, 19 and 20 (9:14, 16; 19:31; 20:1, 19) has no references to the temple in their near context. In the story connected to the festival of *Booths* (ἡ σκηνοπηγία) in Jn 7–8 (7:2, 37), the temple is mentioned in 7:14, 28, as well as in 8:20, 59. The celebration of the Passover is not uniquely attached to the temple in Jerusalem by John. As Jn 6 bears witness to, Jesus is also presented as celebrating the Passover in Galilee, which means that not all these festivals are presented as pilgrim festivals, but all passages with references to the Passover will be discussed to see if there are issues that might be connected to a replacement of the temple institution in the Johannine community. The passages containing references and discussions of the Sabbath will not be commented on unless the passage forms a part of a larger context with direct references to other festivals. Jn 5 in fact combines references to several institutions; the chapter speaks both of an un-named festival (5:1), the Sabbath (5:9, 10, 16, 18), the temple (5:14) and of the scriptures (5:39) and is for that reason of particular interest.²

Generally, the Fourth Gospel is more focused on Passover festivals than the Synoptics are, and John is the only gospel that mentions the festival of Booths.³ This observation may indicate that John

² Cf. the recent overview of temple festival themes and discussion of this same matter in Kerr (2002:204ff). Kerr concludes that Jesus not only fulfils but also replaces the festivals Passover, Tabernacles, and Dedication with his own person (2002:266–267). I have myself come to the opposite conclusion, in accordance with Frühwald-König (1998) who concludes that Jesus is presented as temple adherent (*Kultteilnehmer*) and not as abrogator (1998:169).

³ John mentions Passover 9 times in several connections and reports 3 different Passovers (Jn 2:13; 6:4; 11:55), while the Synoptics mention it 15 times (Mark 4 times, Matthew 4 times and Luke 7 times) and only one Passover during the ministry of Jesus.

was eager to present what he might have looked upon as a new and theological understanding of these festivals. Consequently, and as I pointed out in the previous chapter, it has been argued by several scholars that the approach to the festivals in John has a particular theological significance and therefore a particular place in what I have called his 'replacement strategy'. Schlatter (1975) contended long ago (first published in 1930) that while John makes the participation at the festivals in Jerusalem a main part of his gospel, the church is nevertheless looked upon as 'free' from the Jerusalem institution by the way John presents the actions of Jesus there (cf. Schlatter 1975:140). Brown (1966:CXLI) argues that the mention of festivals in Jn 5-10 makes up the structure of the third part of what he calls the 'Book of signs' (1:19-12:50). He also argues that this third part often bears witness to a replacement of the motif of the festival:

Part III (chs. ii-iv) is dominated by Jesus' actions and discourses on the occasion of the Jewish feasts, often again by way of replacing the motif of the feasts' (Brown 1966:104).

Even Dunn, who is much more (and rightly, I think) careful in his conclusions than many other scholars regarding the relationship between Judaism and Christianity (see 1991; 1992; 1996), takes several statements in John to mean that the great pilgrim festivals such as the Passover and Tabernacles were superseded. He concludes that 'there is no longer need for such feasts in their traditional cultic form to be celebrated any longer', and that the old temple and cultus have been rendered redundant (Dunn 1991:94).

Redundancy may generally be understood in a strict as well as in a less strict way where social consequences are concerned. There are observations pointing in both directions. This is indicated by Brown too, when he says that the theme is 'often' used to replace the festival motif in the 'history of salvation'-scheme. Schnackenburg (1971b:18) argues likewise that the mentioning of the Passover in 6:4 has no theological significance, only chronological, and in connection with 5:1, that the 'evangelist' concentrates on what is important for the presentation of Jesus and his revelation and that the mentioning of the festival is not important (cf. Schnackenburg 1971b:119).

One should also have in mind that festivals are mentioned without any further identification (4:45; 5:1), and one significant festival that is related to celebrations in the temple, Pentecost, is conspicuous by its absence. The mentioning of a *ἑορτή* in 4:45 (perhaps referring

to the Passover of Jn 2) does not lead to a discussion of the festival as such in its near context, but the mentioning of the festival may indicate the direction of orientation among the Gospel's audience. Jn 5:1a has only a possible reference to a temple festival by using the expression ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, the report saying that Jesus was going up to Jerusalem (5:1b) and to the temple (5:14), but it is difficult to figure out exactly which festival John is referring to.

The fact that John mentions festivals without any further indication of a theological purpose, and the fact that the Gospel does not comment on all possible temple-related festivals directly, also suggest that the festival theme in John is not used to introduce an overall re-interpretation of this part of the Jewish traditions.⁴

6.2 THE UNKNOWN FEAST

Several attempts have been made to identify the unknown feast mentioned in 5:1 (μετὰ ταῦτα ἦν (ἡ) ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, κτλ.). If the article is included (Σ C L Δ Ψ), 'the feast' probably refers to one of the main feasts, Passover or Booths/Tabernacles, feasts often characterised in that definite way (Barrett 1978:251). Without the article, the reference to one particular festival is dubious. It has been identified with the festivals of the New Year, Passover, Booths, Pentecost, and Purim.⁵

An exact identification is necessary to judge the temple replacement motif of the whole Jn 5 since the passage introduced by 5:1 lacks other references to temple-related issues (the main focus is rather on the Sabbath). As long as a positive identification is not attainable, the value of the entire passage as indicative of a larger replacement is limited. Rather, it may even strengthen an argument saying that the low interest in exact replacement formulations in a gospel

⁴ Related themes of transformation are particularly associated with ecclesiological issues in Pauline writings. Paul's relationship to the temple has been presented in chapter 4, particularly Paul's understanding of the congregation and the body as temples. In addition to temple related issues, some other issues could also be mentioned. Paul uses a language of cultus when he speaks of himself as a minister of Christ for the Gentiles, serving the gospel of God as priest. He presents his ministry in priestly terms (e.g. Rom 15:16). However, there is no complete replacement statement in such a metaphorical language.

⁵ See the discussion of the scholarly situation in Manns (1995:117); Schnackenburg (1971b:9, 118–119); Brown (1966:206).

written as late as John reflects a similar opinion in the Johannine community. Nevertheless, some of the attempts of relating the passage with a particular feast must be evaluated. The identification of the feast may be based upon internal (the themes of Jn 5) and/or upon external criteria (the structure of the entire Gospel or non-Johannine sources). The identifications of the feast based upon internal criteria are methodologically uncertain for my purpose as they may lead to a circularity of arguments; the feast first identified by the themes in Jn 5 is said to have been overthrown by the author and his audience based upon these same themes.⁶

The several different theories concerning the identification of the festival are telling for the ambiguous festival character of the passage in relation to my subject. Scholars such as Barrett (1978:250–251), Brown (1966:206), and Schnackenburg (1971b:ad loc.) rightly reduce the importance of this festival reference as an interpretative key. In addition, textual evidence against the article as original is strong,⁷ and the festival theme does not play a major part in the passage as such. The only observation that may connect the themes of the passage to a specific festival or to other Jewish customs of the kind is the mentioning of Jesus coming to Jerusalem (5:1), that he went to

⁶ Guilding (1960:69) argues that the festival is Rosh ha-Shanah (Lev 23:23–25) since the lectionaries of the Jewish synagogues at that time of the year were dominated by judgement themes which are similar to the main themes in John, see 5:22, 24, 27, 29, 30. Manns (1995) argues that the festival should be identified with the festival of Booths, indicated by the themes associated with this festival in the context, Jn 5–8, similar to themes connected to the festival of Booths found in rabbinical and other Jewish literature (Philo, Targums etc.). Manns presents a highly symbolical understanding of the passage connecting it to the festival of Booths, interpretations that I think are overinterpretations, e.g. when the mentioning of the man's age in Jn 5:5 to 38 years is taken to allude to the time of Israel in the desert (cf. Deut 2:14), and the miracle is taken to symbolise a spiritual resurrection. Other themes mentioned by Manns, e.g. the judgement theme, seem more appropriate. Bowman (1975) finds many ties between the book of Esther and the Gospel of John and thus contends that the festival was the Purim festival celebrated on the 14th/15th of Adar (February–March). This assertion is logical if we read 4:35 historically to refer to four months before the time of harvest, but the historical value of the information is rather limited and we should not depend too much on it. Schnackenburg (1971b:9, 118–119) uses the re-organisation of Jn 5 and 6 to support the theory that John is referring to the festival of Pentecost. However, the major problem with all these approaches, both internal and external, is why John chose not to mention which festival he is actually referring to, or why he does not bother to render it explicitly.

⁷ $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ from ca. 200 and $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ from the third century.

the temple (5:14), and that the episode took place on a Sabbath (5:9). There is no stated link between Jerusalem, the temple location and the christological claims later in the chapter. Thus, the mentioning of ‘temple’ and ‘Jerusalem’ here seems to have minor significance. Two other institutional aspects of Jn 5 are more interesting for this analysis as a general background for the institutional approach, i.e. the Sabbath conflict and the statement concerning the status of the scriptures (αἱ γραφαί in 5:39, 46). A possible replacement of the temple institution by the Johannine community could be reflected with an implicit or explicit connection between the mentioning of the unknown temple feast and these other institutional aspects of the text.

John introduces a Sabbath conflict (5:9b) that is reported to lead to a persecution of Jesus (5:16). There are two reasons presented for this persecution, that he was violating the regulations of the Sabbath, and that he made himself equal to God (cf. the phrase οὐ μόνον ἔλυνεν τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεόν ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ θεῷ, 5:18). The statement that the healing took place on a Sabbath is connected to the christological claims for the explanation of John when he argues that the Son may do what the Father does (5:19–23), implying that as the Father did work on the Sabbath, so did Jesus (5:19). This discussion concerning the Sabbath could indicate a sharp division between Jesus and his opponents (Pancaro 1975:500), but similar discussions are also found in Philo and other Jewish sources (Borgen 1991).⁸ The discussion can therefore not be looked upon as a Johannine particularity, and it demonstrates how difficult it is to say that the Sabbath is deliberately abrogated by Jesus—and consequently for the community for the reasons the author has stated.

In Jn 5:37–38, the author mentions three different ways of knowing God: by hearing his voice, seeing his form, and possessing his words. These three ways probably refer to the revelation made to ‘Israel’ in general, and is probably a reflection of the prerogatives claimed by the opposing Jews, as Pancaro (1975:224ff) argues. In that case, they believe and claim that they have heard God’s voice,

⁸ In his study of Jn 5, Borgen (1991:209ff) argues that John follows the traditional form case-debate, see also my references to Borgen in chapter 4. In Jn 5, the passage 5:1–9 represents the case while 5:10–18 is the exposition. Supporting his theory he finds that:

seen his forms and that they possessed his words, but in reality they have not—the Johannine Jesus says. John argues that the right understanding is based upon the fact that the scriptures testify to Jesus: καὶ ἐκεῖναί (sc. αἱ γραφαί) εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (5:39). This argument is repeated and thus strengthened by the statement of 5:46 that clearly says that Moses had Jesus in mind: εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν. Dahl (1962:133) contends that by refusing to believe in Jesus the Jews ‘prove that they have no share in the revelation given to Israel at Mount Sinai’, and Borgen (1965:151) concludes in a similar vein that the Jews ‘misuse the scriptures because they interpret them without recognizing their testimony to Jesus’. The statement of 5:39 may therefore demonstrate a view on the relationship between the scriptures (the potential replaced institution) including the Mosaic Law and its temple prescriptions on the one hand, and Jesus (replacer and replacement) on the other. It is not probable that John has the temple directly or indirectly in mind in 5:39, 46, but if there are to be institutional related messages in Jn 5, the connection with the statement concerning the scriptures is a notable one. However, the section 5:37–40 is better understood as an expression of the Johannine community (Pancaro 1975:231; Barrett 1978:267) and its discussions with its Jewish opponents at a later stage. Barrett concludes that what John means is that ‘the truth of God in Jesus is self-authenticating in the experience of the believer; but no such convenient

-
1. The identification of the case-debate structure is also found in the synoptic parallel, e.g. Lk 13:10–17,
 2. the same form may also be identified in Mt 12:1–18 and Mk 2:23–28,
 3. as well as in Jn 7:21–23; 9:1–41,
 4. in Jn 7:21–23, Mt 12:1–8 and Lk 13:10–17 the same way of argument is employed,
 5. in the subsequent discussion after the case, John refers back to the initial case both generally and by repeating certain words, and
 6. in Jn 5:1–17 and 7:22–23 there are halakic expositions also found in other Jewish sources. In t. Sabb. 15:16, there is a similar discussion to that in Jn 7:22–23; in addition, we find similar discussions in Gen. Rab. 30:6 and in Philo Leg. 1:18.

Moreover, the discussion seems to be similar to the discussion alluded to in Philo Migr. 86–91 which like Jn 5:1–18 takes up the attitude towards the Sabbath and both passages presuppose a discussion of Gen 2:2–3, and they both argue that the activity of God on the Sabbath is an argument for not observing prescriptions for the Sabbath as, for instance, the prohibition against carrying anything.

phrase lay to his hand.’ (1978:267). In that case, the role of Jesus as replacer of institutions is diminished.

A similar connection between the tradition and Jesus is also evident outside Jn 5 and may strengthen this understanding. We find a similar relation in 1:17 and in 1:45, places in which Moses is also mentioned, and it is perhaps alluded to in 2:22 and in 3:10 as well. Jn 1:17 has no direct relational statements either (see also my discussions in chapter 4) and this verse (1:17) does not say that the Law is abrogated by the ‘glory and truth’. Jn 1:45 declares in a straightforward manner that Jesus was the one Moses and the prophets wrote about (cf. ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται εὐρήκαμεν). This statement may demonstrate that for the Johannine community also the coming of Christ did not divulge a mere rejection of the Law, because by way of a logical reasoning, Jesus would then reject himself. In 2:22, the author declares that the disciples did not understand the scripture until after the resurrection when they finally believed the scripture and the word of Jesus (cf. καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς). The notion ἡ γραφή (in singular) generally refers to a particular passage of scripture (see my discussion in chapter 4 and in Barrett 1978:201). It could nevertheless be seen as a reference to an authoritative tradition, and this tradition is then presented as generally accepted.⁹ In 3:10, Jesus rhetorically asks the teacher, Nicodemus: σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις; He perhaps indicates by this question that Nicodemus should have understood Jesus from the teaching Nicodemus himself represented, a teaching that was certainly based upon traditional writings (Barrett 1978:201). As Pancaro (1975:508–509) writes, the Law according to John should lead to the recognition of Jesus. Pancaro (1975:509) also argues that the Law is looked upon as violated by those who condemn Jesus (relying on Jn 5:17; 6:28–29; 7:19, 24; 8:15). This understanding could indicate a

⁹ There is a similar use of the notion νόμος as well. Pancaro (1975:523) argues that John uses νόμος in a more negative way than γραφή. He argues that the difference indicates that John looked upon νόμος in a negative way (‘the Law of the Jews’), while γραφή has a positive connotation. I am reluctant to see this difference as a reflection of a conscious distinction in the Johannine community. Particularly, the idea of a ‘normative Judaism’ that Pancaro operates with in this connection is difficult. Pancaro, too, concludes in the end that the Law is not viewed negatively by John, only the misunderstanding of the Law (1975:528).

sharp distinction between Jesus and the temple in the eyes of John, but the evidence here is not as direct as it is in connection with the claim that the Law bears witness to Jesus. The Law is by John looked upon as supporting his unique position and indirectly the Gospel therefore supports the Law, at least in this matter.

There are no direct links between the statements in Jn 5 concerning scripture and the temple that may serve as background for the mentioning of the feast in 5:1. This is not the way this passage may help us in our quest for the Johannine attitude towards traditional temple Judaism. The stated relationship between Jesus and the scriptures may, however, be a possible analytical model for the relationship between Jesus, the Johannine community and the Jewish institutions as such. Both the celebration of the festivals, the Sabbath and the temple offerings and sacrifices were prescribed in the Law. It is, in fact, the scriptural aspects of Jn 5 and other passages that turn out to be *the main sociological key* to our understanding of the relationship between the Johannine community and these institutions. Jn 5:39, 46, combined with 1:17, 45, partly 2:22 and with 3:10, do not diminish the value of the scriptures as witnesses mentioned in these passages. On the contrary, they are reinterpreted in a way to demonstrate that they refer to Jesus and are thus also valuable for our evaluation of the community and its social characteristics.¹⁰ There are, however, observations that point in another direction too, particularly in the Passover discussion of the ‘true bread’ (Jn 6).

6.3 THE PASSEOVERS

6.3.1 *The Main Themes*

In the Passover passages,¹¹ John draws on three temple-related themes,

1. The temple buildings themselves (Jn 2:13–22),
2. the manna discussion (Jn 6), and
3. the Passover lambs sacrificed in the temple (Jn 13–19).

¹⁰ Cf. Smith (2000:8), who supports similar theories concerning the Gospel of Matthew, where, as he says, the status of Moses is ‘not denied, but revised’.

¹¹ With ‘Passover passages’ I refer to passages recounting incidents reported not only to take place during the Passover itself (τὸ πάσχα), but also connected to Passover times.

It has been argued by scholars that in the passages referring to these themes, Jesus himself is connected to the objects stated, to the temple building, the manna and the Passover lamb and that John thus opens the possibility of reading them as replacement statements (see below). These connections are, however, questionable and as I shall demonstrate, they are not significant for the interpretations of the implicit relationship between the Johannine community and the Jerusalem temple on what Martyn (1968; 1979) has named the second level of interpretation.

The first theme, the discussion of the replacement of the functions of the buildings with the functions of the body of Jesus, combined with the discussion concerning the proper place of worship, has already been discussed above in connection with the analysis of Jn 2 and Jn 4. The second and the third theme will be discussed below in connection with my analysis of Jn 6; 11; 13–19. These themes (manna and the Passover lamb) are linked by way of Christology to what is regarded by John as the Moses-Exodus event (in a broad sense), and thus a possible basis for typological interpretation as well. Typological interpretation is generally a type of interpretation that relates two entities in a way that may involve a kind of replacement and thus is particularly important for my overall discussion. The replacement themes in relation to the texts of Jn 6; 11–19 have, of course, much wider christological consequences than those concerned with the relations between Jesus and the temple only. In accordance with general limitations of my analysis, I shall focus on christological claims that may reflect a replacement by the community of Passover traditions linked to the temple themes actually mentioned in these texts.

6.3.2 *A Replaced Passover in Jn 6?*

6.3.2.1 *The Frame*

Jn 6 may be arranged in many ways or seen as a complete whole. Based on the temporal indicators in 6:16, 22, 66, as well as on the conclusive statements in 6:59, 66, the text may be said to have five distinctive sections.¹² First, there are the two narratives; the story of

¹² The indicators are found in 1) 6:1, 2) 6:16, 3) 6:22, 4) 6:59 and 5) 6:66, see Beasley-Murray (1987:85).

the feeding of the five thousand (6:1–16) and of Jesus walking on the water (6:16–22). Then comes a discourse section concerning the ‘bread from heaven’ (6:22–59). At last comes a section with two dialogues reflecting in some way on the previous passage (6:60–65, 67–71), but this section is disconnected from the rest of the chapter by the closing statement in 6:59. I argued in chapter 4 that the references to τὸ πᾶσχα in 2:13, 23 constitute the ‘Jewish’ frames by which John defines the scene in that passage. Jn 6:4 and 6:59 function in much the same frame-like way for the first three sections. 6:4 introduces the scenery similarly to 2:13 declaring that ἡν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πᾶσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. 6:59 completes the passage by stating that Jesus’ discourse took place in a ‘synagogue’: ἐν συναγωγῇ διδάσκων ἐν Καφαρναούμ (see 6:17, 21, 24, 25), showing that Jesus and the disciples were found at Capernaum after the walking on the water. The discourse that actually is reported to have taken place at the synagogue is then 6:25–58, and this is the passage on which I will concentrate.

Whether the themes of the whole chapter and precisely Jesus’ discourse reflect a synagogaal situation is much debated and the answer to the question depends partly on how we evaluate the unity of the passage. The reason for determining the *Sitz im Leben* is that it influences the determination of the frames that are important for the evaluation of the meaning of the passage for the Johannine community. Barrett (1978:300) claims that the discourse cannot stem from a synagogaal situation because the interruptions suggest a less formal occasion than a synagogaal sermon. Accordingly, what I have called the ‘Jewish frame’ of Jn 6, would be less obvious. Other scholars have, however, argued that the dialogue reported in 6:28–59 between Jesus and the crowd (6:28, 30, 34) is similar to the typical synagogaal discourse pattern elsewhere, found both in later and contemporary literature, in rabbinical texts and Philo.¹³ The resemblance

Concerning the composition of the passage, see Borgen (1965) and the literature in P. Anderson (1996). Anderson has analysed this chapter diachronically with regard to the unity or disunity of the chapter. My approach here is, as stated earlier, synchronically based and my first aim here is to see if John refers to an established alternative Passover or traditions attached to such a Passover (see Sweeney 1999:38ff). From my standpoint, every particular Jewish characteristic of the Gospel tends to strengthen the view that there were still ties to traditional Judaism in the Johannine community.

¹³ Mek. on Exod, and Philo, e.g. Contempl. 75–78, QG and QE (see Borgen 1993:274–275).

with the synagogal situation in later rabbinical writings is of course interesting (cf. Guilding 1960 and Gärtner 1959), but independent Judaeo-Hellenistic sources demonstrating similar milieus and forms of activities are not found, except for the description of the Therapeutae in Philo *Contempl.* 75ff.¹⁴ The fact that there are similarities on a literary level is in itself valuable; combined with the internal evidence, the frame is clear enough or at least satisfactory for the purpose of my analysis. Although Jesus does not make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem this time, he is once again placed within a typical 'Jewish' context by John and I take the statements in the bread from heaven discourse to refer to a Johannine attitude on the second level as well.

John limits the synagogal reference to 6:22–59, while the mention of the Passover festival seems to refer to the whole of Jn 6. This is at least the impression we get if we take 7:1 to indicate a new passage.¹⁵ In other words, in this chapter we find a combination of a synagogal milieu and some kind of a Jewish Passover location for the discourse scene. Worth noticing is that the relation towards the synagogue is not presented as negatively in this passage as it is in Jn 9. The context of Jn 6 defines Jesus quite in accordance with Jewish traditions, *not* antagonistically. According to my view, this is also the case in connection with the story of temple cleansing in

¹⁴ Every seventh day, Philo says (*Contempl.* 31), the Therapeutae meet as for a general assembly, and a senior among them gives a discourse while the others sit still. However, they also celebrate a holy symposium or sacred banquet, where the 'President' discusses and solves questions raised (*Contempl.* 75). Hypoth. 7:13 states that the Jewish Alexandrians sat quietly during the exposition of the scriptures during the meeting on the Sabbath: 'most of them [sit together] in silence' (οἱ πολλοὶ σιωπῇ). *Spec.* 2:61–62 also mentions that the audience in the schools sat quietly σὺν ἡσυχίᾳ, but the text does not state how the topics were chosen and thus cannot be used as a counter argument to the 'question and answer'-form or procedure so evident elsewhere in Philo, see particularly the discussion by Runia (1991:48) concerning this matter in Philo (QG and QE).

¹⁵ Alternatively, 5:1 indicates the start of the next passage, if one accepts the rearrangement of these chapters. Bultmann (1971:203, 209–210) puts the narrative into (from his point of view) a more logical order, 4:43–4:43–54; 6:1–59; 5:1–47; 7:15–24; 8:13–20. The aporiae are evident, but Barrett (1978:272) is right in asking if good history writing really was the primary aim for the author. Beasley-Murray (1987:xlīi–xlīii) argues that the author might have left the Gospel in an unfinished state, but he also agrees with Dodd (1953:290) and other scholars who wanted to see if the text makes sense as it stands. The possible rearrangement of Jn 5 and 6 does not affect the evaluation of the replacement involved. Possible replacement ideas are introduced by the mentioning of the Passover at the beginning of the section Jn 6:1–59.

2:13–22. Nevertheless, a replaced object is perhaps presented by the reference to the Passover and the Jewish frame in 6:4, and we should therefore continue the search for relational statements that could further define the social importance of the frame.

6.3.2.2 *The Passover Themes of Replacement*

The reason for locating the incidents referred to in Jn 6 to the Passover may be more than incidental, as several scholars have argued. The mentioning of the grass on the mountain (see 6:10: ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ) may, as Schnackenburg (1971b:18) contends, indicate spring-time, and is thus in accordance with the temporal location at Passover. The reason for mentioning the grass is perhaps not to indicate the coming of spring and Passover, it could just be a reminiscence from Mk 6:39, but it underlines in any case the previous note that the incident took place at the time of Passover. Guilding (1960) and also Gärtner (1959) use later synagogue lectionaries to throw light on the passages. Gärtner takes 6:4 and 6:59 as a starting point to see how the lectionaries may explain the paschal theme in Jn 6. These lectionaries in use just before the Passover concentrated on the central facts of the coming festival, i.e. God's saving acts towards Israel in bringing the people out of the bondage of Egypt (cf. Lev 23; Num 9; Josh 5). Similar features are found in Jn 6 with the allusions to Moses and the manna miracle. The late date of these lectionaries and the lack of evidence for their existence in the first century, make them uncertain as interpretative keys to an understanding of the Johannine community. They nevertheless indicate that there are related Passover topics in these lectionaries that may be connected to a discussion of this section.¹⁶ It has also been argued that the Passover location mentioned in 6:4 governs the whole narrative on a general ground and in that case, it could inaugurate a possible replacement motif connecting Passover to the temple.¹⁷ The mentioning of the Passover seems strained in comparison with the synoptic account that presents Jesus as having

¹⁶ See also the discussion of the Sabbath services in McKay (1994).

¹⁷ Hoskyns (1947:281) argues that 'The movement from the miracle to the discourse, from Moses to Jesus (vv. 32–5, cf. 1.17), and, above all, from *bread* to *flesh*, is almost unintelligible unless the reference in v. 4 to the passover picks up 1.29, 36, anticipates 19.36 (Exod 12.46; Num 9.12), and governs the whole narrative'. This argument is supported by Carson (1991:268).

celebrated only one single Passover during his ministry, and this is an argument for saying that John has given it a particular theological significance. Barrett sees the Passover in connection with the Eucharist in Jn 13:1, which again ‘must be understood in the context of the Jewish Passover’ (Barrett 1978:274).

Some observations speak against this connection between the Passover theme and Jn 6 generally and thereby also the claimed replacement motif involved and its meaning for the community. It is clearly stated that the Passover was not yet celebrated, it was only *near* (cf. ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα). In combination with the statement that Jesus did not go up to Jerusalem, and thereby did not pay a visit to the temple, it reduces the relevance of the passage in connection with an analysis of the Johannine temple attitudes. John may deliberately have connected the Passover with the presentation of Jesus as the ‘paschal lamb’ and the Eucharist, as Barrett (1978) suggests, but this theme is neither mentioned nor indicated in this passage. The Passover and the paschal lamb are not directly connected in the Johannine retelling of the last Passover either (11:55ff; 19:36–37), but there are some strong indications to such a conscious connection in Jn 19 commenting on the σῶμα of Jesus (19:31, 38, 40; 20:12). According to 18:28b the priests were about to eat the Passover (φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα), meaning perhaps that Jesus was crucified at about the same time as the paschal lamb was slaughtered, and the scriptural references in 19:36–37 also refer to the paschal lamb theme. In Jn 6, there is a possible reference to the body of Jesus in 6:51 where the ‘bread’ is identified with the ‘flesh’ of Jesus (cf. καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν), and ἡ σὰρξ may again be connected to τὸ σῶμα which is mentioned after the crucifixion at 19:38 and referred to indirectly in connection with the treatment of the body on the cross (19:33–37).

We see that the Passover themes are present but not directly employed as replaced objects in John’s relationship towards the temple, although the paschal lamb theme may be understood as a replacement of the Passover sacrifice. A further discussion of this sacrificial replacement theme in John demands a broader discussion of Jn 18 and 19. Before discussing this theme further, I shall first take a closer look at the manna theme itself in Jn 6 and possible replacement expressions.

6.3.2.3 *Manna as Replaced Object?*

Relational statements and potential replacement themes in the passage 6:25–59 are as follows:

1. 6:27: the food that perishes and the food that endures,
2. 6:32: the Father gives the true bread from heaven,
3. 6:49–50: the bread that one may eat of and not die,
4. 6:55: true food and true drink,
5. 6:58: eat the bread from heaven and live forever.

All these statements are in one way or another concerned with the theme of food, (ἡ βρώσις, ὁ ἄρτος, τὸ μάννα). In addition, Jn 6:42 indirectly refers to the bread by taking up καταβαίνω from the preceding verse (ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβάς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) in the expression ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα. All these statements compare Jesus with some other entity.

Jn 6:27 connects Jesus (the ‘Son of Man’) to ‘the food that endures for eternal life’ and compares him in contrast to the other sort: ‘the food that perishes’. 6:32 connects Jesus to the meaning of the expression ‘true bread from heaven’ (see 6:35) and compares him in contrast to the bread from heaven at the time of Moses. In 6:42, Jesus is connected to ‘the bread from heaven’ and compared with a figure the participants knew, i.e. the ‘son of Joseph’. 6:49–50 connects Jesus to ‘the bread from heaven’ that one may eat and ‘not die’ and compares him in contrast to ‘the manna in the wilderness’ that did not prevent them from dying. In 6:55, the ‘true’ food (and ‘true’ drink) is connected to Jesus through his ‘flesh’ (and ‘blood’) and without directly comparing it with food that is not ‘true’. 6:58 again (as 6:49–50) connects to Jesus ‘the bread that came down from heaven’ and the claim that this bread leads to eternal life. John compares it with the ‘bread’ the ‘ancestors’ ate, which at last did not prevent *them* from dying. Understanding the food aspect is thus central to our understanding of the relational character of the passage, and the manna-concept is again central within that aspect.

The μάννα concept itself is mentioned twice, in 6:31 and then taken up in 6:49. In 6:31, the μάννα is made coequal with the bread (ὁ ἄρτος) and in the exposition in 6:32ff Jesus himself is defined as the life-giving bread. He concludes by saying: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς (6:35). Within the perspective of my analysis, the question we shall have to answer is therefore how the manna is said to relate to

‘the bread of life’ and how this relationship then may be linked to Passover and the specific temple issues in a way that is sociologically significant. I shall argue that even if we read the manna and bread of life (Jesus) to be typological entities, there is little evidence saying that the bread of life is superior to the original manna in a way that points towards an abrogation of the Passover or temple traditions in practice. The manna theme is connected to the presentation of Jesus as a Moses-figure and the ‘prophet to come’. The presentation of Jesus as a Moses-figure, including the feeding of the people with manna in 6:5–13 (cf. Exod 16 and Num 11) and the subsequent exposition, may in fact represent the link between the Passover mentioned in 6:4 and the rest of the passage. John declares Jesus to be the ‘prophet to come’ in 6:14 (οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον).¹⁸ There could also be a hint to the Moses tradition in the story of the miracle, when John describes Jesus and the disciples as going up the mountain (6:3, cf. Exod 19:3, 20; 24:12–13) as Yee argues (1989:64). In addition, there may be a parallel between the story of the feeding of the five thousand and the story in Exod 24:9–11 where Moses and the elders go up the mountain and partake of the covenantal meal in God’s presence. Yee also argues that the feeding story in Jn 6 thus could symbolise the inauguration of a new covenant. There is, however, little in the story that alludes to covenantal and inauguration aspects. Moreover, the relational aspects of the miracle towards Jesus is elaborated only after 6:25, and in this latter passage Jesus is set up against the manna, not Moses. Moses is set up against the Father according to 6:32–35.

In a similar typological manner, Gärtner (1959:17) sees the crossing of the sea as a recalling of the Exodus traditions found in Ps 78:18–19 LXX, ‘the second exodus’ (Beasley-Murray 1987:89). These allusions to Moses here are vague and present no relational aspects between Jesus and Moses; relational aspects are necessary to identify the degree of replacement involved. The understanding Gärtner presents builds upon a typological exegesis. The typological understanding of Jn 6 meets another difficulty—a difficulty Gärtner also admits. According to the traditional Exodus narrative, the water mir-

¹⁸ This identification of Jesus as ὁ προφήτης may be a reflection of a Messianic anticipation based on Deut 18:15–22 and a similar connection is also found in Qumran and Samaritan writings (Barrett 1978:277).

acle (in contrast to the chronology in John) came before the manna miracle. Besides, Jesus did not go through the water, but *upon* it (ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης), which is a detail that also reduces the degree of replacement ideology involved. Not only is the basis for seeing the text in such a typological perspective in itself weak, but the significance of a typological interpretation for a possible replacement of the original story and the institutions attached to it—such as the Passover—seems to be taken too much for granted. Any typological reading cannot simply be looked upon as an expression of competition or as an expression of replacement of the original idea, practice, or institution. The main section for the study of relational aspects is therefore still 6:25ff and the main possible replaced object referred to here is, as stated above, the manna.

The connections between Passover and Exodus themes (Exod 11–20) and the main themes of 6:25ff are easily detected as John himself refers to the manna and to the Sinai event, thus also connects them to aspects of the Law. I shall evaluate the degree of replacement involved in the stated relational statements in the passage 6:25–59, i.e. 6:27, 32, 49–50, 55, and 58.

According to 6:31, Moses gave manna to the fathers or the ancestors (οἱ πατέρες). The true bread, however, is now given by the Father according to 6:32. The ‘true bread from heaven’ is interpreted in 6:33 to be the bread of God. John obviously creates a common platform for both the ancestral manna and Jesus as they both are said to have come down from heaven. By so doing, John also makes the difference between them explicit. Jesus is defined as a possible replacer by declaring that he is the *true* bread (ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἀληθινός). The other is not declared to be *not* bread, but clearly inferior bread. In 6:49, the stated relationship between these two kinds of bread is described by the words connected to ‘life’ (ζωή and ζάω) on the one side (6:47, 48, 51) and ‘death’ (cf. ἀποθνήσκω) on the other (6:49, 50). This is an even stronger indicator of the inferior status of the original manna in relation to the true bread.

It may be argued that by the use of the word ἀληθινός the Gospel attacks ‘false ways, misleading guidance, false prophets and leaders who appear on the scene of history, whether Jewish or not’, and that it presupposes the existence of other possible, but *false* ways (Aalen 1964:22). However, for the general conclusion one cannot overlook the fact that there are two contradictory statements to his thesis, found in 1:45 and 5:46. In these verses, John states that Moses

was testifying *on behalf* of Jesus. This does not mean that the Sinai event was looked upon as adequate by John, but it cannot be looked upon as rejected either. This is in accordance with Dahl's interpretation (1962:130ff) that the scriptures bear witness to Christ and that the prophecies are fulfilled in Jesus, 'rather than to a history of salvation of the past, with an importance of its own'. Nevertheless, Dahl argues, the author does not 'ignore that there was a history even before Christ'. I shall argue that the statement concerning the relationship between the scriptures and Christ corresponds to the attitude in the Johannine community. This seems to be a fair description of how the members of the community looked upon the relationship between the community and the temple institution, a description that also has sociological value.

The statement saying that his flesh is bread and his blood wine (6:54) has certainly sacrificial overtones, reflecting a Eucharist language; in that case it could be indicating that a Christian Eucharist meal had replaced the Passover sacrifice in the Johannine community at the time when these passages were formed. However, these allusions are allusions only and not connected to the Passover sacrifices or the temple by John. The allusions to the Eucharist in 6:53–58 cannot be used to say that such a meal replaced any other Jewish custom or ritual; it can only be said to be an innovated ritual filling sacrificial functions. There is, in fact, nothing in the text that directly states that the celebrations of the Passover and related themes are replaced, so we shall have to detect possible *indirect* evidence that, of course, leads to a much less secure conclusion.

6.3.2.4 *The Degree of Replacement*

There is particularly one passage in Jn 6 that may reveal a negative attitude towards the Sinai event and the Law on the second (community) level—a statement similar to statements found elsewhere in the Gospel on the matter. This is Jn 6:46 declaring that no one has seen the Father, except the one who is from God: οὐχ [λέγω] ὅτι τὸν πατέρα ἑώρακέν τις εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗτος ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα. 5:37–38 says that the 'Jews' have never heard the voice of the Father, or seen his form, and his word is not abiding among them. Likewise, 1:18 declares in a similar vein that no one has seen God—except the Son. It is perhaps these three statements (1:18; 5:37–38; 6:46) that together verify the strong position of Jesus and thereby could indicate a rejection of the Sinai event/the Law by the

Johannine community, a final proof of the partings of the ways and, accordingly, also a rejection of the traditional institutions.

There are, however, observations that strongly point in favour of another and opposing understanding—as I also argued in chapter 4 and we must bring these observations into balance. Jn 1:45; 2:22; 3:10; 5:45–46 all claim that Moses or the Scripture bears testimony to Jesus. ‘Scripture’ must be understood as a traditional writing that is looked upon as essential for the partakers of that tradition. 10:35 explicitly claims that the scripture cannot be annulled (cf. οὐ δύνανται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή). Although this is within a different context, it clearly demonstrates a fundamental view on this scripture. 12:37–41 also declares that Isaiah spoke the way he did because he saw Jesus and likewise in several passages it is stated that what happened with Jesus took place in order to ‘fulfil’ (πληρώω) the scripture (13:18; 19:24, 36).¹⁹ Thus, we have 1:45; 5:46; 10:35 on the one hand, stating that what the scriptures claim is true. On the other hand, we find passages like 1:17; 5:37; 6:46 with a more negative attitude towards the ancestral traditions. The opposition is false, however, since what Jesus is criticising is the negative attitude to the opponents’ understanding of the scriptures. 1:45; 5:39, 45 clearly say that the scriptures testify on his behalf. This solution points more towards a surpassing than an abrogation of traditional writings and the Sinai event, also in the community of John. This is not a struggle concerning an abrogation of the traditional institutions (broadly speaking) they were legitimising, but an interpretation of them. The opponents pervert the scriptures, as Barrett concludes referring to Bultmann’s commentary (Barrett 1978:268). The rejection of the word of God by the opponents is both a cause and a sign of unbelief (Barrett 1978:267), but the rejection is not a rejection of the scriptures themselves. Carson (1991:268) also admits that the combination is not easy. If the Johannine readers had the same attitude towards the temple as the attitude possibly inherited in the references of the scripture, the temple would neither have been rejected nor neglected.

Jn 2:13–22 describes what may be called a transference of the meaning of the temple from the physical buildings to the body of

¹⁹ Jn 13:18 (on Judas son of Simon Iscariot), 19:24 (on his clothes) and 19:36 (on the broken bones). These statements are, on the other hand, directed to particular events and their scriptural base, and should perhaps not be read in a general way.

Jesus. In like manner, Jn 6 includes an interpretation of the manna as the bread of life: Jesus. It is a transition from physical bread to another meaning of the word 'bread'. It is, however, difficult to say whether this interpretation reflects a new practice in the community. 5:38–39, 46–47 suggest that the scriptures were employed as testimonies on the behalf of Jesus and thus not abrogated. The negative statements concerning the Sinai event in Jn 6 should be compared to the more positive attitude in Jn 5. This insight indicates that they had not discarded the scriptures, the temple, or Passover celebrations in practice, for instance, by no longer reading the scriptures, attending temple services or celebrating the festivals.

Gärtner (1959:51) concludes that the 'Christian Passover contains the fulfilment of what in the Jewish is only 'typos' and promise'. My conclusion would rather be that the author of Jn 6 presents statements that were able to pave the way for a Christian Passover. The relational statement is not of such a character that we must conclude that a total replacement had already taken place for the Johannine community.

6.3.3 *The Passover-Theme in Jn 11:55; 13–19*

Jn 11:55 introduces the last Passover in the ministry of Jesus as the general background for Jn 13–19. References to the *πάσχα* are numerous (12:1; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14). The word *ἑορτή* is also taken up in 12:12. Jn 11:55b explains that the purpose of going up to Jerusalem for the Passover, was to become purified (cf. *ἵνα ἁγνίσωσιν ἑαυτούς*). The purification theme is repeated in 13:10 when Jesus washes the disciples' feet.

The main question for my analysis of these chapters is the status of Jesus as paschal lamb (cf. *ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*) in 1:29, 36, or as a sacrifice. There are several allusions to the Passover lamb in the passion narrative of John (see Brown 1994:1371–1372):

1. Jesus is possibly crucified during the time of preparation of the Passover meal on the 14th of Nisan (18:28b). In addition, Jn 19:14 (*ἥν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἔκτη*) may demonstrate that the trial took place the night before the Passover, on the day of Preparation. Moreover, 19:14 points in the same direction when it indicates that Jesus was crucified at the same moment as the priests started to slay the lambs for the paschal meal on the 15th of Nisan.

2. The hyssop mentioned in 19:29 alludes to the Exodus story (hyssop was used to sprinkle the doorposts with the blood of the lamb, cf. Exod 12:22).
3. John writes that the legs of Jesus were not broken (19:33), thus fulfilling the requirement in Exod 12:46; Num 9:12 not to break a bone of the paschal lamb.
4. The blood of Jesus is poured out (together with water) from his pierced side, cf. 19:34 (ἀλλ' εἰς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἔνυξεν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ) alluding to the blood of the lamb.

Brown (1994:1350ff) evaluates different attempts to solve the discrepancies between the chronology in John and in the Synoptics. He rejects them all (1994:1369ff), although he also thinks that there are solid reasons for judging as historical that Jesus died on Friday, the day before a Sabbath that began in Friday evening (see Mk 15:42), on the 14th of Nisan. His main argument is the early identification of Jesus with the paschal lamb (see 1 Cor 5:7; 11:23–25).

However, a synoptic-Johannine solution to this problem is perhaps easy enough. There are, in fact, two main alternative possibilities that may reduce the theological implications of the passion narrative in John in relation to a sociologically significant replacement of the temple: John's chronology is wrong or we do not understand what he refers to. Carson (1991:589) argues in favour of the latter solution saying that Jn 18:28b may demonstrate that the incident in the praetorium happened before Passover, but that even *this* note is ambiguous since Passover and the feast of Unleavened Bread seems to have been generally mixed at the time, see Lk 22:1, 7 (and also Mk 14:1, 12). The expression 'eat the Passover' (Jn 18:28b) is ambiguous, also according to Brown (1994:1354); it may not necessarily refer to the eating of the Passover meal itself but also to the feast day generally, to the slaughtering of a lamb or a goat and to the subsequent meal. In addition, it may refer to a more general celebration during the Passover, the Passover itself plus the celebrations connected to the feast of Unleavened Bread (see Carson 1991:589–590). In that case, it would also be possible to reconcile the Synoptic and the Johannine presentation (contra Brown 1994:1369). An even more simple solution is to conclude that the Johannine evidence is too ambiguous and most probably wrong. In either case, the Johannine theology involved in the chronology is less evident (see Carson

1991:457, contra Brown 1994:1371; Barrett 1978:51). The Eucharist meal reported in the Synoptics, and perhaps suggested in Jn 13:1–2, was a Passover meal and Jesus was crucified the day after. This surely reduces the possibility of theological interpretations and replacement involved in the Johannine presentation of the death of Jesus as paschal lamb.

Jn 19:33 is in fact the only clear reference to the Passover lamb, but the connection between Jesus as the Lamb of God (1:29, 36) and Jesus as Passover meal cannot be directly identified in the text and the degree of replacement involved therefore seems low. In addition, the mentioning of the water does not harmonise with the understanding of Brown that the passage alludes to the Passover lamb. Brown (1994:1372, n. 41) argues that John has expected his readers to perceive allusions to the symbolism of the feast in the portraying of Jesus at the festival of Booths (Jn 7). The allusions to the festival in Jn 7 are quite strong (see below). Since the Johannine leaders probably knew Jewish customs well as they had been ejected from the synagogue, the use of symbolism in Jn 11 and 13–19 may be in accordance with the general use of festival symbols in John, Brown argues.²⁰ Brown also points to the fact that John does not explain how the atonement expression ὁ αἵρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου is to be understood. There are therefore no explanations of this expression in the Gospel itself, although the Johannine Epistles present some clues.²¹ In view of the problems in finding direct and complete replacement statements in Jn 2 and 4, the evidences from the Epistles do not explain the relations between the Johannine community and the temple institution satisfactorily. The fact that Jesus was understood as a lamb of God by the early Christians as Paul indicated in 1 Cor 5:7; 11:23–25 (see Brown 1994:1396), is important. However, from my point of view, the evidence from Paul demonstrates that the belief that Jesus was a paschal lamb is not

²⁰ 'That Jesus the Lamb of God was sentenced to death at the very hour when lambs for the Jewish Passover began to be killed would constitute a replacement theme (i.e., Jesus in place of a significant festal motif) quite at home in John's treatment of Jewish feasts' (Brown 1994:847–848).

²¹ There are explanations in Johannine Epistles, in 1 Jn 1:7 and 2:2 saying that the blood καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας (1:7) and of Jesus that ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (see Brown 1994:1371). The statements from the Epistles, that the blood cleanses from all sin and that Jesus is the atoning sacrifice, are significant statements, but they do not explain the relationship between Jesus and the temple sacrifices properly.

connected to any radical rejection of the temple sacrifices as the first Christians and Paul, according to Acts, did not break with the temple (see my discussion in chapter 4).

In connection with my analysis of Jn 2 and 4 and the possible replacement motifs there, I have argued that the Johannine attitude concerning the temple buildings as a place of worship is probably not an expression of a general rejection of the temple functions alluded to in John. This is a conclusion that is crystallised when we compare the attitudes reflected in the writings of Philo and from Qumran. My analysis of the temple-related evidences from the Passover passages in John does *not* alter that conclusion.

6.4 THE FESTIVAL OF BOOTHS

6.4.1 *Possible Replacement Motifs*

The festival introduced in Jn 7:2, the festival of Booths (cf. ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία), does not change this conclusion either. The two main themes related to the festival are the water and the light, notions of a symbolism that may be connected to particular rites at the temple at the time of this festival. For my analysis, the question again is whether the use of these symbols indicates a rejection of these particular issues on the part of the Johannine community, and also whether such a rejection may be related to the temple institution as such.

The scene is once more placed within a Jewish context, in this case the festival of Booths or Tabernacles, the eight-day autumnal celebration of the vineyard harvest.²² The word ἑορτή is repeated

²² In Deut 16:13 and Lev 23:33–43, it is called סוכה ('huts'), but it is also named the 'festival of Ingathering' (שָׁבוּעַ) in Exod 23:16; 34:22. It is also often only referred to as יְהוָה ה' 'festival of the Lord' (Lev 23:39; Num 29:12; Judg 21:19) or ה' 'the festival' (1 Kgs 8:2; Ezek 45:25; Neh 8:14). The fact that there are two different Hebrew names of the festival סוכה and שָׁבוּעַ, may reflect the dual function of the festival, it seems to have been both a celebration in thanksgiving for the harvest and a commemoration of the protection of God of the people dwelling in booths during their time in the wilderness, see Barrett (1978:310). Philo explains the festival (ἑορτὴ σκηναί) in that same dual manner in a thorough description in Spec. 2:204–214. That the festival was important is indicated by the fact that Josephus calls it 'especially sacred and important by the Hebrews' (Antiq. 8:100, and cf. Antiq. 8:123, 15:50). The water and light motifs (see 7:38; 8:12) are associated with the thanksgiving of the harvest, and the exodus theme is no longer in the forefront as it is in Jn 6.

several times during this passage (7:2, 8, 10–11, 14, 37; 8:20) thus indicating the importance of the general setting of the scene. The first part of the Tabernacles scene is introduced in 7:2 and closes in 8:20 with the mentioning of Jesus teaching in the temple (cf. ἐν τῷ γαζοφυλακίῳ διδάσκων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ). That passage in turn closes in 10:22 where the festival of Dedication is introduced (see Brown 1966:CXLI). The main possible replacement motifs are presented in 7:2–8:20 and I will confine myself to this part.

As was the case in 2:13 and in 2:23, the frame presents Jesus as partaker of the temple celebrations. In 7:14, Jesus is also reported to have been at the temple to teach, but there are few other textual evidences linking this passage to the festival of Booths, except for the water-motif in 7:37–39 (in addition to 4:10–14; 6:35) and the light-motif in 8:12. Lindars says that

It is very widely held that the invitation of verse 37 is related to the ceremonies of the feast of Tabernacles, which Jesus uses as a basis for his teaching

(1972:297).²³ These links are not connected to the temple by John, but are perspectives mainly derived from the later rabbinical sources (see below). There are nevertheless some relational aspects in the present text, particularly between Jesus and the ‘Jews’ that are interesting from my perspective. These stated relations are situated in three different divisions of the passage.

The passage may be divided into three parts marked by the temporal references,

1. 7:1–13 before the festival (ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς ἡ ἑορτή)
2. 7:14–36 during the festival (ἤδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσοῦσης ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν)
3. 7:37–8:20 on the last great day (ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς).

Each of these passages refers to the relationship between the crowd (ὁ ὄχλος), or the ‘Jews’, and Jesus. There is nothing in the first and second part that interprets the festival in an innovative way. The

²³ On locale and Christology, see Jn 7:14, 28; 8:20, 59. See Schrenk (1965) and his emphasis on the location in Jn 5:14; 8:2.

first part has references to his relationship to his brothers (οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ), the world (ὁ κόσμος), the 'Jews' (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) and the crowd (ὁ ὄχλος). In the second part, John reports a discussion between Jesus and the 'Jews' concerning the principles of the Sabbath and circumcision, leading to a discussion of whether he was the Messiah or not. The third part is, however, much more significant as it takes up motifs that could have been essential in the festival celebrations at the time of the Second Temple.

There is another possible replacement motif in the locations presented by the Gospel where Jesus reveals his own status. Schrenk (1965) points to the fact that according to the Gospel, Jesus chose a different place for his teaching than did John the Baptist (18:20). While John the Baptist is said to have remained in the desert and on the shores of Jordan, we are told that Jesus met people in the synagogues and at or around the temple in Jerusalem. Schrenk (1965:242) also notes that important self-witnesses are given in the temple, and concludes that this demonstrates the superiority of Christ over the temple:

Not by accident the questioning, the concern of the people regarding Him, and His most solemn self-declarations are all located in the temple precincts, Jn 7:14, 28; 8:20, 59; 10:23; 11:56. Emphasis is laid on the location of the healing in Jn 5:14 and in the *μοιχαλὶς* story in Jn 8:2.

However, since the text itself does not connect the location to the contents of declarations concerning his relationship with the Father, we should be cautious to read too much into the location of these statements. It is true that these self-declarations are solemn and that they are all uttered in connection with the temple somehow, but the self-declarations do not directly relate to the temple themes. When Jesus, in Jn 7:28, states at the temple that he has been sent, and that the citizens of Jerusalem do not know the one who sent him, this cannot be taken as a statement against the temple institution by the author and by the community tout court. The sense of superiority, as stated by Schrenk, over the temple in these declarations must be inferred from arguments read 'between the lines'.

6.4.2 *Water as Replaced Object, Jn 7:37–44*

On the last day of the festival (the seventh or the eighth),²⁴ the priests passed through the Water Gate and encircled the sacred altar seven times with the waters drawn from the pool of Siloam, see Schnackenburg (1971b:211).²⁵ At the same time Jesus is reported by John to proclaim *ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος* (7:37b–38). It is not possible to find the exact location of the scripture John is quoting here, but there are some texts that are similar to this one in the Old Testament/Tanakh. Ps 78:15–16 talks of God's provision of water for Israel in the wilderness, cf. also Exod 17:6; Num 20:2–13; Isa 43:20; 48:21. To find other texts connected to the Tabernacle festival celebrations is another possibility. Zech 14:8 describes 'living water' which shall flow out of Jerusalem 'on that day'. We also have a possible replacement reference to Isa 44:3–4 and to Joel 2:28 (3:1) speaking of the outpouring of God's spirit. In addition, the themes of light and water have both a Johannine²⁶ and a wider background.²⁷ In 7:39, the water is paralleled with the spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα).

The two possible interpretations concerning the location of the water source is not essential from my perspective. The first one postulates that Jesus is the source of the living water and the second one that the believer is the source. In the first one, a christological solution leans on 7:39 that identifies the πνεῦμα with the living water in an overall replacement theory in John as advocated by some scholars (Brown 1966:307; Yee 1989:79). Jesus is described as bringing water, so the question is whether the believer has the same source as well, which is probably the meaning; see 4:14 which states the relationship between the water of Jesus and the source of the believer

²⁴ Which day it refers to is somewhat ambiguous; see Barrett (1978:326) who thinks the eighth day suits fine, but that the question is unimportant.

²⁵ Schnackenburg refers here to the rabbinical citations in Billerbeck 2:490–491 and 2:799–805 (Strack and Billerbeck 1965). Particularly are m. Sukkah 4:9 and t. Sukkah 3:16–17 possible references to the historical situation of the second temple that might explain the allusions in John.

²⁶ As in Jn 1:4–9 (light) and 4:10–15 (water). The light-motif is frequently in use throughout the Gospel, see 3:19; 5:35; 8:12; 9:5; 11:9; 12:35, 46.

²⁷ For instance in the Qumran writings but also others, see Pancaro (1975:473ff), Barrett (1978:327, 335–337); Hoskyns (1947:365).

(ὅς δ' ἂν πῖν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, κτλ.). For my interpretation this discussion is not too important since Jesus, after all, *is* described as a source. The main point for me is the fact that the relation between the water libation rites in the temple is not stated explicitly.

The water motif used in 4:15 does not contain relational aspects of interest either. In 4:15, it is said that the woman wishes to obtain the water of Jesus (cf. δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν). Indirectly, the drinking water in the well is described as inferior to the water of Jesus—a kind of replacement, but not an indication of abrogation. In 7:37ff, the relational aspect is lacking. Thus, it may very well be that John draws from the rich background for the festival of Tabernacles, but the actual replacement statement is conspicuously absent. Moreover, there are severe problems in seeing the water that comes forth from the side of Jesus in 19:34 as a signal of the Messianic age. Particularly difficult is the identification of this water with the water in the water-libation rites of the temple. This symbolic reading of the text that is taken as an argument for a total rejection of the traditional belief has no support in the text itself and must be seen as an over-interpretation of little historical value.

If the passage is to be understood in such a way that it is the believer (ὁ πιστεύων) who is the source,²⁸ and if the statement should mean that Jesus has replaced the old temple, the believers must also be looked upon as new temples. In that case, it is also difficult to conclude that the saying of Jesus refers to a serious replacement of the temple functions generally.

6.4.3 *Light as Replaced Object, Jn 8:12–20*

Jn 8:12 also makes use of a light imagery similar to the traditional imagery of the Tabernacles festival. There is a rabbinical tradition that the light from the great candelabra in the court of women brightened all of Jerusalem (m. Sukkah 5:3). Jesus is likewise said to be the light of world in 8:12 (ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου), which is part of the light-darkness dualistic theme in John. The sayings of

²⁸ It is difficult to find an acceptable solution to the difficulties involved in the text here, see also Brown (1966:307).

Jesus seem to be related to the traditional festival themes of the temple. As in connection with the previous statement of Jesus saying that he is the life-giving water, the 'Jews' who now approach him also come from the group of Pharisees (8:13). Ulfgard (1989:117, 145) argues that John lets Jesus even supersede the feast just by *referring* to these themes.²⁹

To refer to them is, however, not equivalent to replacing one by the other from a sociological point of view. Michaelis (1964:394) thinks that the theological implications of the reference to the festival of Booths are not extensive:

So verstärkt sich der Eindruck, dass es ohne besondere theologische Bedeutung ist, dass bei ihm das Laubhüttenfest einmal den Hintergrund des Auftretens Jesu in Jerusalem bildet.

Pancaro (1975:487) is likewise reluctant to see too much in the Torah references in the passage.

The mentioning of the temple treasury in 8:20 might have some symbolic meaning pointing towards a replacement of the temple generally, but again we must be cautious to avoid over-interpretation. John declares that Jesus is the light of the world, but never says that this light has now abrogated the light of Booths in the temple. As with the water motif, Jesus does not suggest that he has replaced the old light, only that he possesses the true version of it. Compared to the statements in 4:21–23 there is little difference in regard to the degree of replacement involved in Jn 8:12–20. Therefore, there is also little in the sayings of Jesus during the festival of Booths/Tabernacles that points to a rupture with the temple institution and the festival functions by the Johannine community. On the contrary, the adherence of Jesus expressed in the frames of the stories of the Booths, suggests that Jesus is not meant to be presented as having abandoned the temple festival.

6.5 FESTIVAL OF THE DEDICATION

In the story with events connected to the festival of the Dedication, Jn 10:22–39, Jesus is once again described as partaker of the tem-

²⁹ 'The Johannine references to the feast serve to emphasize the characteristic role of Jesus in this gospel as the one who supersedes and fulfils Jewish concepts and institutions' (Ulfgard 1989:145).

ple festival activities. This time it is a festival in the memory of the re-dedication of the temple by the Maccabeans in 165 BCE as recounted in 1 Macc 4:41–61 (cf. ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις Jn 10:22a). The frame is thus established by Jesus going into the temple area (10:23) and then by the flight away from it (10:39). The festival may have had similarities with the festival of Booths and its motifs of light. Josephus calls the Dedication the ‘festival of light’ (Antiq. 12:235). The resemblance with the festival of Booths has made scholars to see a connection with the light-motif of Jn 7 and the degree of tension and replacement involved may therefore be evaluated (see e.g. Moloney 1996).

As we have seen several times in connection with the cultic associations in the descriptions of Jesus, there is dissent among scholars concerning the degree of replacement involved. Schnackenburg (1971b) argues that the passage presupposes the discussion in Jn 7 and he even contends that the temporal reference in 10:22 χειμῶν ἦν, refers to a description of the spiritual climate (‘das geistige Klima’ 1971b:382). Barrett, on the other hand, is much more reluctant: ‘it does not seem possible to detect any symbolical correspondence between the conduct of the feast and the ensuing discussion’ (1978:379). Lindars claims that ‘John’s composition shows no sign of being influenced by this [the ceremony of the feast]’ (1972:366). Even Brown (1966:405), the one who has most sharply formulated a replacement theory in connection with the Gospel of John, argues that it is difficult to see how the festival should have formed the whole passage. He also argues that the two festivals, the Booths and the Dedication, were historically linked since the break between Tabernacles and Dedication is not so sharp as the break between the other feasts (Brown 1966:404).

We should therefore expect to find the similar features treated by the Gospel as well, but in this passage, John is concerned with a debate that is not primarily directed at festival issues. At the outset we should perhaps expect that the temple-related themes in this passage were similar to the theme of 2:13–22, i.e. the temple building itself, but neither the temple generally nor the temple buildings are mentioned, so the theological implications of the mentioning of this festival do not seem far-reaching at first look. In fact, the only reference to a dedication of any kind is 10:36 that uses ἀγιάζω (cf. ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;). This use of ἀγιάζω finds

no real parallel in the New Testament. Barrett (1978:385) would like to translate it with its normal biblical sense 'to set apart for God's purpose' but neither this word nor its Hebrew equivalent, שָׁדַךְ, necessarily indicate a sacrificial meaning. The allusions to the priesthood of Jesus seem much closer than the allusions to the temple itself (see Brown 1966:411), also alluded to in 6:69 and possibly in 19:23. The connection with Jesus' priesthood is also possibly present when Jn 19:23–25 mentions the tunic (ὁ χιτὼν) of Jesus and the tunic may be interpreted as referring to the tunic of a high priest. This allusion to the high priest is, however, too vague to represent a derogatory action symbolising the abolishment of the priesthood (see Pancaro 1975:342–343). Brown (1994:957) refers to de la Potterie who has argued that the interpretation of the tunic as a high priestly vestment is a relatively modern insight. There is a possible connection to the consecration of leaders by Moses in Num 7:1–2, but there is no parallel to the temple as such. Barrett (1978:385) finds such a relation possible: 'As Moses sanctified (. . .) the Tabernacle and its contents for their holy purpose, so God sanctified (. . .) Jesus for his mission'. There is a plausible connection here, but the actual mission and its relationship to the temple institution is not stated. Thus, the reported consecration of Jesus does not seem directed towards a temple imagery, nor is the relationship to the temple institution stated in the text.

The christological debate reaches its turning point at 10:30 with the claim that Jesus and the Father are one (ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν). John further writes that the 'Jews' attacked Jesus because he made himself equal to God (10:33). Perhaps with the knowledge in mind of the story about Antiochus Epiphanes who desecrated the temple by erecting a statue of Zeus in it, the 'Jews' are reported to protest against Jesus when he claims that ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἑσμεν. Brown (1966:411) argues that 'consecrated' (ἡγίασεν) in 10:36 joins in with the replacement theme of the 'Book of Signs' (Jn 5–10).

Admittedly, there are some similarities between the original festival and the way John presents it, and the festival might have been appropriate as a location for the Johannine purpose of the passage, i.e. the confrontation with the 'Jews' on the status of Jesus as Son of God. The accusation from the Jews concerning blasphemy (βλασφημία in 10:33) does fit well the overall theme of the festival of Dedication, but John does not state that Jesus replaces the temple. We cannot use this passage to argue that the Johannine com-

munity would have rejected and neglected the feast in principle since this is not suggested or hinted at.

The epilogue of the passage is set in 10:41–42 which reports the saying among those who came to him at the same place at which John the Baptist used to stay (cf. πάντα δὲ ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου ἀληθὴ ἦν). According to 1:19–34, what the Baptist actually did say was:

1. He is only a forerunner of Jesus (1:23–27),
2. Jesus is the lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (1:29),
3. the Spirit descends on him and he baptises with the Holy Spirit (1:33), and
4. therefore he was the Son of God (1:34).

The festival of Dedication may have made some people conclude in a similar way about Jesus, but again nothing conclusive is said that would indicate that the participants reacted against a new institution to wipe away the old.

The passage demonstrates sharpened attitudes towards the ‘Jews’ by Jesus. The unique position of Jesus in relation to God is accentuated, and when this accentuation is reported to take place on the festival commemorating the victory over a king who called himself ‘Epiphanes’, the reactions of the ‘Jews’ seem understandable. But there is nothing indicating that a replacement of temple institutions itself is hinted at by the author and consequently, by his community. The Dedication passage is in fact a passage with little significance for the study of a possible temple replacement in John.

6.6 LOW DEGREE OF FESTIVAL TENSION

In this chapter, I have focused the analysis on a possible clarification of the attitudes and relationship towards the temple institution in temple-related passages in the Gospel of John outside Jn 2 and 4. I have not found evidence that changes the earlier conclusions concerning the location of John within the three suggested models of relationship to worship and temple (rejection, conjunction and acceptance). Seen together with the conclusions from an analysis of other relational aspects in Jn 4, 5 and 6, I shall conclude that the textual

evidence for the assumption that the Johannine community had totally rejected the temple institution and established its own independent institutions is further weakened. The analysis has discovered a deficit of textual evidence for the scholarly opinions in this matter in relation to my sociological perspective. As long as the alternatives are abrogation and acceptance, the texts quite clearly demonstrate abrogation of the temple. However, as soon as a semi-position ('conjunction') is raised as a possible alternative, the texts so to say 'answer' differently.

To be sociologically significant, any complete replacement needs a possible replacer and something possibly replaced, as well as a stated relationship between these entities. Most of the passages studied in John above all lack the replaced object. When the body of Jesus is described as a temple in Jn 2, we have an implicit replaced object, but not a stated relationship. The statements in Jn 4 concerning the place of worship have both a potential replaced object (Gerizim and Jerusalem), a possible replacer ('true' worship) and a stated relationship (4:21) indicating abrogation. The Passover passage in Jn 6 does refer to a replacer, ὁ ἄρτος, a possible replaced object, τὸ μάννα, and a stated relationship expressed by the use of the word 'true' ἀληθινός, thus indicating an inferior status of the replaced object vis-à-vis the possible replacer, but it does not imply a far-reaching rejection of these institutions. The festival of Booths in Jn 7 has both a possible replaced object (ordinary water used in the libation rites), a replacer (Jesus in 7:37 et al.) and a stated relationship ('living' in ὕδωρ ζῶν) indicating a surpassing of this living water with the ordinary water by Jesus or as Jesus as the source of water. In the Dedication passage in Jn 10, we do have a possible replacer ('Jesus is consecrated') and indirectly a possible replaced object (the temple), but no stated relationship between them. None of these satisfy the simplest requirements in a thorough statement of replacement.

The best evidence for a radical replacement attitude in John is still the statements concerning the worship in 4:21–23. This is the passage with the best-documented relationship that also indicates a neglect of the temple. However, as I have demonstrated, a similar attitude was found in Philo's writings, and when looking closer into Philo's texts, I found that Philo's stated anti-temple attitudes are even more profound than the attitudes evident about Jesus and his practice and belief in the Gospel of John. The Philo evidence shows that

it was possible at that time to reject the temple in principle and accept it *at the same time*. This observation is sociologically significant, in spite of the other, and admittedly significant, substantial differences between John and Philo.

I have suggested that the problems involved in assuming a radical temple replacement in the Johannine community find a possible solution in verses like 1:45 and 5:46. These passages may also be used as interpretative keys to the passages mentioning other Jewish institutions in the Gospel of John. The words of Jesus are not seen here as representing a complete substitute to the Jewish scriptures. As the scriptures—including the institutions prescribed by the Mosaic Law—do ‘testify on his behalf’, we cannot say that they were rejected in a way that reflects total neglect. The temple, festivals, and other institutions mentioned in the Gospel are reinterpreted in a way that may have *prepared for* a replacement at a later stage and they were easily at hand when the temple was destroyed. On the basis of the situation seen behind the Gospel we can infer a practice of abrogation neither of the temple institution nor of other traditional Jewish institutions.

I have developed my argument following two different paths, a deductive one (from modern models), and an inductive one (from the texts) in a dialectic relationship. The question concerning the relations between the community and the parent body is essential for the sociological categorisation of all the groups in question. My investigation of temple relationship statements in John soon brought up three possible types of relationship. Of the three possible models of relationship developed in chapter 2, the most likely model in regard to the temple relationship, is the ‘conjunction model’, the ‘both-and’ attitude. In accordance with the sociological perspective of this investigation, I have focused on the social practice and on the interpretation of John’s narrative in passages that do not always explicitly invite us to read them metaphorically. In my investigation of John, I have found it probable that the social practice we may infer from the temple passages is that the members of the alleged Johannine community followed a common early Christian matrix of critical temple loyalty. The actual destruction of the temple is not an argument against this conclusion. In fact, it is the assumption that the community rejected the temple institution that begs the question. Even in the immediate years after the destruction, when the Gospel of John was completed, both Jews and Jewish Christians—

including the member of the Johannine community had to relate to the temple institution in some way, regardless of the existence of temple buildings.

It has now become probable that the temple relationship of John is a 'conjunction' relationship, as it does not present to us a particularly high-tension group. However, all the sociological models of 'sectarianism' and other deviant types of groups presuppose that the groups according are high-tension groups. The groups that we may locate within the parent body always demonstrate a low degree of tension, while the 'sect' with their diverging practices and beliefs are located at the other end of the tension continuum.

CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN JOHN

7.1 WHY AN INVESTIGATION OF SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS?

With all its literary, historical and theological particularities it is quite natural to think that the Fourth Gospel reflects an origin in a group in sharp tension with its surrounding, and a situation where the Gospel is seen as both cause and result of this tension in compliance with *inter alia* Meeks (1972). Scholars often focus on the sharp delineation of the community and withdrawal from its surroundings or the world in general as one of its main ‘sectarian’ characteristics (cf. Segovia 1981:272, 1982; Smith 1974–1975:223). Tension, however, cannot be seen as identical to the model ‘sectarianism’ according to common social scientific definitions. Tension is after all a relative phenomenon; its force depends dialectically on both the group in question and the surroundings.

I have argued that compared to Philo and Qumran writings, the expressed temple relationships in the studied passages of the Gospel of John present a tense situation, but do *not* reflect a particularly high-tension group. A promising way to further analyse the social relationships of the community is to draw conclusions from the presentation of Jesus and how he met with non-believers. The main passages that present the stories of persons and named groups that meet Jesus will be analysed below. These passages concerning ‘others’ or social relationships shall be considered as bearing witness to external attitudes and relationships of this community. Again, I shall conclude that the picture of an isolated Johannine community is too strained and one-sided. The Gospel of John presents an ambivalent, but nevertheless also *friendly* image of how Jesus and the disciples responded to those who did not participate in the early Jesus movement.

Scholars have already analysed many essential aspects of the alleged community’s social boundaries and I see no reason to study these aspects in detail. While Meeks (1972) and scholars who share his perspective (see above) have analysed the relationship of the community towards the environment in general, Brown (1979) wanted

to test the 'sectarian' claim by looking at their relationship to other Christians (including what he calls 'crypto-Christians'). Onuki (1984: 83ff) chooses another solution. He discusses the 'outside world' ('Ausserwelt') by describing the social function ('pragmatische Funktion') of the authorising and sending (missionary activity) in and by the community (see Jn 3:11; 9:4; 13:20; 20:19–23), as well as the function of the dualistic language. Similarly to Brown, Dahl observes that the way of defining the Johannine community as 'sect' according to the practice of Meeks, fails to distinguish the relationship of the Johannine 'sectarians' to their Jewish environment from their relationship to non-Johannine Christians (Dahl 1990:336, n. 26). In addition, possible relationships to other groups in the Gospel have been analysed in a non-sociological perspective as the basis for an evaluation of the general socio-cultural background of the Gospel.¹ Since all individuals in the first-century Mediterranean defined themselves and others in categories of 'in-group' and 'out-group',² finding expressions that indicate strong social boundaries is hardly surprising and in fact reduces the exclusivistic impression of the community. There may nevertheless be various degrees of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' and it is exactly the question of degree that is to be discussed.

Martyn (1968; 1977; 1978; 1979) analysed the relationship between Jesus and his followers as a conflict with the 'Jews'. As previously stated, much of the theoretical supposition for my investigation is based upon the theory saying that the Gospel reflects one particular historical conflict, the conflict with a local synagogue. This chapter intends to include the relationship to supposed non-Christians and non-Jews to the analysis. The negative attitude towards the 'Jews' is also an important element in other conflicts described in the Gospel as well, and regularly connected to the temple institutions in some way or the other (Jn 2; 4; 7; 5; 10; 11; 18–19).³ The encounter of

¹ See Bultmann (1925) on Mandaean influence. On Docetism, see my comments on Käsemann in chapter 1, and particularly the sharp criticism of the theological presumptions of this approach in Frey (1997).

² As pointed out above, see Malina and Rohrbaugh 1998:238.

³ Chilton (1992) touches upon several of the same temple issues that I am analysing below, but with a different focus (sacrifice) and a different perspective (social anthropological modes from R. Girard), see also my chapter 2. See the importance Brown (1966:CXLI) allocates to the Jewish institutions as the temple and worship in his division of the text. Cf. Dunn (1991; 1992) who uses large parts to explain the relationship between the temple and Jesus/the first Christians.

Jesus with the Samaritans in Jn 4 is perhaps the best example of a connection between the temple question and the attitude to 'outsiders'. However, every time the temple is mentioned, the relationship to 'outsiders' is, in fact, in some way also touched upon, although not all of these passages are significant (e.g. 2:23; 4:42; 5:16; 7:35; 10:16, 42; 11:52; 18:28).⁴

Again, to support the analysis of these observations historically, I shall compare the observations in the Gospel of John with similar features in Philo and Qumran writings (see below). In the Qumran writings, the names of 'others' are few and those who do exist, often seem strongly encoded, while Philo presents a long and detailed straightforward range of different names of groups and nations. One element in my analysis below is to see if, and eventually how, attitudes towards 'outsiders' and the temple worship are connected in a similar way in John, Philo, and Qumran. However, I shall argue that the use of some named groups or collective terms also indicates the general quality of the relationship to 'others' or 'outsiders' in the Johannine community. The advantage of these collective terms from a socio-redactional perspective is that they directly state a relationship with the mentioned groups or persons and in some important instances present them in an un-coded way. The relationship between continuity and disengagement from 'Israel' (see Elliott 1993: 34–35) is indicated in my reconstruction of their temple relationship and as we shall see, this relationship also comes to expression in connection with the presentation of Jesus and his attitudes towards 'others'.

7.2 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN JOHN

7.2.1 *The World*

The main problem with the designations describing the external relationships in the Gospel of John is not to find probable historical references on the first drama level, but rather to find the meaning on the second level. The notion κόσμος is typical for the exegetical problems.

⁴ The relationship to 'strangers' has been discussed by different scholars in Feldmeier and Heckel (1994), but not in a comparison like mine. For other literature, see below under the headings of John, Philo, and Qumran.

The word is used as much as 78 times, reflects both criticism and acceptance of and by the surroundings. It certainly has a variety of references. It may, for instance, refer to 'Jews' generally (12:19; 18:20), to the creation of the universe (1:10; 17:5) or in many instances simply to everyone (15:18). The word is significant for our understanding of the external relationship of the community, since particularly from Jn 12, the 'world' can be seen as a part of the dualistic pattern of social meaning, i.e. a division between Jesus, his followers (those who believe in him, i.e. the community) and their opponents (those who do not believe).⁵ Before Jn 12, the presented evaluation of the 'world' is much more favourable.⁶ The impression of a social dualism is, however, further strengthened when we include the possible meaning and reference to groups and persons in notions like φῶς, φωτίζω, σκότος, σκοτία, μισέω.⁷ The use of the words for love φιλέω, ἀγαπάω and ἀγάπη particularly crystallises the problems involved.⁸ God 'loves' the world (3:16), but men 'loved' 'darkness' rather than 'light' (3:19), while Jesus tells the disciples to 'have love for one another' (13:34–35; 15:12).⁹

Jn 17 is of particular importance with its high frequency of occurrences of the word 'love'. Jn 17:14, 16 indicate the dualism and hatred from and to the surroundings.¹⁰ However, 17:15 seems to be

⁵ For instance in Jn 12:25, 46; 13:1; 14:17, 27, 30; 15:18–19; 16:11, 20, 33; 17:6, 9, 13–17; 17:25; 18:36. In Jn 3:16, the world is split up into two components, those who believe and those who do not (see Barrett 1978:161).

⁶ See for instance Jn 1:10a; 3:16–17; 4:42; 6:14, 51; 8:12.

⁷ Light, φῶς: Jn 1:4, 5, 7–9; 3:19, 20, 21; 5:35; 8:12; 9:5; 11:9–10; 12:35, 36, 46; φωτίζω 1:9; σκότος 3:19; σκοτία 1:5; 8:12; 12:35, 46; μισέω 3:20; 7:7; 12:25; 15:18, 19, 23–25; 17:14. Jn 6:17; 20:1 refer only in a concrete way to the darkness of the night and are not interesting here.

⁸ To love, φιλέω: Jn 5:20; 15:19; 16:27; 21:15ff; ἀγαπάω 3:16, 19, 35; 8:42; 10:17; 13:1, 34; 14:15, 21 etc.; ἀγάπη 5:42; 13:35; 15:9–10, 13; 17:26. Brown (1970:497–499) joins the scholars who argue that the difference between these words is insignificant.

⁹ No wonder Brown (1979:64) concludes in accordance with Meeks that the rejection produced an increasing sense of alienation 'so that now the community itself is a stranger in the world'. Käsemann (1968:59–60) accuses John of narrowing the scope of Christian love in that he speaks of love for one's friends rather than for enemies. I think Barrett (1978:96) rightly argues that this conclusion is superficial in the end since the object of the mutual love is that the world may come to believe and then be incorporated into the group, but that he is also right when he argues that this understanding of love might lead to an exclusiveness that reversed the attitude of Jesus as seen from the Synoptics.

¹⁰ For this and similar descriptions (μισέω 3:20; 7:7; 15:18–19, 23–25; 17:14), see e.g. the commentaries of Brown (1966:508ff) and Barrett (1978:161). The descrip-

even more important for our overall understanding of the community's social characteristics: Jesus prays that the Lord does not take them out of the world, only to keep them from evil or the evil one (cf. οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ). Likewise, in 17:18, 21b–23 their mission to the world is stressed, i.e. to make the world believe that his Father has sent him. The core message from 17:15, 18, 21b–23 (*not* out of the world, and sent *to* the world) is just as important for our evaluation of the community as the message from 17:14, 16 (hatred, and they do not belong to the world). The willingness to conquer the world is essential for the overall understanding of this community and has to be drawn into the conclusion together with the declared dualistic picture of the world.

According to a well-accepted understanding of the passage, it is seen as a warning *against* an apocalyptic escapism and gnostic withdrawal from the world (Brown 1970:763ff; Barrett 1978:509). Although this prayer reflects hostility of the surroundings and to the surroundings on the second level of drama, it is, however, hardly similar to a presentation of a complete insulation or isolation of the group.

7.2.2 *The Samaritans*

The characteristics of the Fourth Gospel concerning the relationship to assumed un-coded named 'outsiders'—or people that are not presented initially as within the Jesus movement—may be gained from a comparison with the Synoptics.

A swift comparison demonstrates major differences. In Lk 2:32, Jesus is regarded as φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν while Mt 15:24 reflects a more strict view when it lets Jesus say that οὐκ ἀπεστάλην εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραήλ.¹¹ This strict view is

tions probably reflect the situation for the Johannine community as well. Barrett points to the fact that the Gospel presents contradictory 'things' about the relationships between Christ and the world (Barrett 1978:162).

¹¹ By referring to Isa 42:6, Lk 2:32 expresses a universal outlook although it is difficult to say whether this outlook is based upon the principle that the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη) are to become Jews in one way or another, e.g. by circumcision. The metaphors of Mt 15:24 may be explained from its context: the Canaanite woman does not represent a person belonging to the house of Israel; besides, she is described as lost or gone astray (ἀπολωλυῖα), perhaps also indicated by the fact that her daughter is tormented by a demon (ἡ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαμονίζεται, Mt 15:22), see Luz (1996:429ff).

modified in Matthew, however, because the text reports that the daughter of the woman was healed at the end due to her mother's faith (Mt 15:28). The commissioning of the disciples in Mt 28:18–20 reflects a situation of missionary activity to all nations: πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. A similar including attitude towards non-Jews is stated by Luke in Acts, e.g. Acts 11:20, and in Pauline literature as 1 Cor 1:24 and Eph 3:28 that present an inclusive attitude. Both attitudes and attainable relationships towards 'outsiders' from the synoptic passages and Paul reflect a missionary activity towards non-Jews. In the Gospel of John, however, a gospel possibly written down 40–50 years after the Pauline letters, similar signs of a direct missionary activity are less evident. Nevertheless, the universal outlook in the Gospel (e.g. the outlook indicated by the use of the word κόσμος) and the indications of missionary activities in the story of Jesus and the Samaritans in Jn 4, indirectly point in the same direction as is also indicated by Mt 28:18–20, to possibly indirect references to a missionary activity.

Dahl (1962) argues that the dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman 'allows the evangelist to show that the contrast between Jews and non-Jews is transcended by the coming of Christ' (1962:127). The 'Jews' on the other hand represent the world and the reason that the missionary activities are absent, is that Israel is described as the centre of the world, a conception that is 'interpreted in a new and revolutionary way' (1962:129), namely that the mission to the 'Jews' is thus understood as a mission to the entire world. I find this solution attractive because it very well explains the use of the word κόσμος together with the use of the word Ἰουδαῖοι, e.g. in Jn 3 in the dialogue with Nicodemus. Is it possible to apply the solution described by Dahl concerning the 'Jews' and the general surrounding to the temple relationship and the relationship to non-Johannine Christians in the Gospel of John?

In Jn 4:1–42, not only the Samaritans are presented, but the passage includes a presentation of the 'Jews', as well as places of worship of these two groups, Gerizim and Jerusalem. These two groups are presented in opposition to each other several times, but the text demonstrates that the focus at the end lies rather on what they have in common than on their differences, as will be shown. Several observations lead to the conclusion that John describes an opposition between the two distinct groups in Jn 4. It is precisely defined that the person who comes to the well while Jesus is sitting there, is a

woman and a Samaritan: γυνή ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας (4:7), and she immediately recognises Jesus as a 'Jew' (Ἰουδαῖος).¹² By using the word Ἰουδαῖος as a description of Jesus over against the Samaritans, both the Jews and the Samaritans are declared by John to be distinct groups. In addition, the woman-man relationship further reinforces the presentation of an opposition between them.¹³

A general reason for the opposition between Jews and Samaritans is given in Jn 4:9b: οὐ γὰρ συγγράνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.¹⁴ It is the verb συγγράομαι that in a particular way demonstrates the unusual character of their meeting.¹⁵ The lack of an object with συγγράομαι

¹² Malina and Rohrbaugh (1998) translate the word with 'Judaean' consistently. The Synoptics are much more precise (cf. Mt 21:23; Mk 11:27; Lk 20:1). In Jn 7:1, 'Judaean' seems to be just as good a translation as 'Jews' at a first glance, but in the following verse, the notion is again used about Jesus in a more general way. In addition, in Jn 2:6 the jars with water are described as a custom of the Ἰουδαῖοι, while the whole episode evidently takes place in Galilee, see the back-reference in Jn 4:46. The Ἰουδαῖοι in 6:41 may be Judaeans, but again the episode is described to have taken place in Galilee. Finally, Jesus is himself described as Galilean in Jn 7:41 in a neutral way, while in Jn 4:9 he is described as Ἰουδαῖος. In Jn 7:1, one may amend the qualification τῆς Ἰουδαίας (or a similar phrase) to the οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and translate, 'he did not wish to go about in Judaea because the Judaean Jews were looking for an opportunity to kill him'. See the survey in Leistner (1974:142ff) who concludes on the basis of the passion story that the Gospel of John cannot be looked upon as anti-Jewish (particularly 1974:150). See also von Wahlde (1982) who concludes that there is little reason to see references to the common people except for Jn 6:41, 52 and that several instances of the word reflect redactional activity. Still, the main point for me is that the word is applied both to Jesus and to his opponents, a fact that must be satisfactorily explained, cf. H. J. de Jonge (2001).

¹³ Barrett (1978:228) calls the conversation 'unusual' because 'it is between man and woman, Jew and Samaritan'. See also Vouga (1977:25).

¹⁴ Barrett (1978:232) calls the appearance of these words a gloss—as they are not part of the woman's speech. They are omitted by some manuscripts (e.g. $\aleph^*$ Φ) but the evidence is not so strong that it can be disregarded as part of the author's composition.

¹⁵ The word has two main possible meanings, 'share vessels with' or 'associate with'. Schnackenburg (1971a:459) contends the latter and uses 'pflegen keine Gemeinschaft'. Daube (1956:375ff) supported among others by Barrett (1978:232), argues that the author has omitted the object 'vessels' and that the verb has to be translated more literally 'to use together' or 'to associate with'. The NRSV (1993), for instance, reflects this understanding and writes 'Jews do not share things in common with Samaritans', without defining what these things are any further. This is in opposition to the (Neo-)Norwegian translation (Bibelen 1985:ad loc.) that writes 'for jødane har ikkje noka samkvem med samaritanane' ('for Jews have no dealings with Samaritans'). Daube argues that this practice may reflect the regulation by later Jewish leaders in CE 65 or 66 as reported in m. Nid. 4:1 (see below). The uncleanness would then necessarily be conveyed to the vessel she held, see Barrett (1978:232).

in 4:9 is strange (Schnackenburg 1971a:459), but a vessel is referred to further down in the passage (4:11) in a way that presupposes that Jesus could not use the woman's vessel. So Daube's understanding (1956:375ff) explains well why the woman in 4:11 does not offer Jesus the vessel (ἄντημα) *she* had been using to fill her water-jar (ὕδρία) and which she later left while she returned to the village (Jn 4:28). Although a reference like m. Ber. 7:1 may demonstrate that some Jews did in fact eat together with Samaritans at a date earlier than the writing of the Mishnah,¹⁶ the regulation from m. Nid. 4:1 seems to reflect a long-standing popular sentiment that Samaritans, and particularly women, were unclean.¹⁷ Because of the late dating of this prohibition, Lindars (1972) also argues that it is possible that John, but not Jesus, knew the prohibition as a Sanhedrin decree. He thinks that the expression with συγχράομαι should be understood more generally: 'The point of the explanation is then likely to be that the Jews do not eat and drink with Samaritans, treating them exactly as if they were Gentiles' (Lindars 1972:181).

Both solutions for the meaning of συγχράομαι indicate Jewish-Samaritan barriers in operation, although the first solution 'associate with' is much more categorical than the second solution 'share vessel with'. Nevertheless, the essential point for my analysis is that the expression in either way shows the opposition between the two groups, and both solutions fully demonstrate an opposition. In 4:20, the woman herself presents a core conflict between Jews and Samaritans, her own Gerizim-tradition and the Jerusalem-tradition, οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦτῳ προσεκύνησαν· καὶ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐστὶν ὁ τόπος ὅπου προσκυνεῖν δεῖ. Although the name 'Gerizim' is not used here, the expression ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦτῳ versus ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις presents the two alternatives of place, mount Gerizim or the temple mount in Jerusalem. The conflict is submitted to the reader as a fact, as 'socially objectivated' (to use a sociological expression). This is particularly shown by the arguing in favour of this practice through a deliberate allusion to earlier traditions in 4:20.

¹⁶ M. Ber. 7:1 writes: '... or [if one that ate was] a Samaritan, they may be included [to make up the number needed] for the Common Grace' (Danby 1933), see also Carson (1991:223–224).

¹⁷ M. Nid. 4:1 'The daughters of the Samaritans are [deemed unclean as] menstruants from their cradle' (Danby 1933:748).

In 4:22 the Samaritans are described as ignorant concerning the object of their worship (cf. ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε), while the 'Jews' represent the informed group in this matter (those who know what they worship, cf. ἡμεῖς προσκυνούμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν), and they are even presented as the group from which salvation comes (cf. ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν). The prominent reference 'you' and 'we' in this verse sharpens the impression of an opposition in such a way that it is fair to say that a conflict is deliberately presented. The scenery is partly presented as a Samaritan-Jewish relation in which Jesus represents the 'Jews' and the woman the Samaritans, a conclusion often observed (Kieffer 1987:115).

Thus, we have several presentations of an opposition, the social entities are named, defined and two core themes of the conflict are presented, i.e. ritual cleanliness and the proper place of worship. In addition, two negative relational aspects are presented, the Samaritans are ignorant of what they worship while the Jews are not, and the salvation comes from the Jews, not from the Samaritans. However, in contrast to these observations we may also notice that in 4:4 Jesus is described as walking to Galilee through Samaria (cf. ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν διέρχεσθαι διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας). The use of δεῖ indicates that the route through Samaria was a natural choice, and with Bultmann (1971:176) one may conclude that Jesus went through Samaria because it was the shortest route (cf. Josephus Antiq. 2:118; Bell. 2:239; Vita 269). It is against Jesus' own word in Mt 10:5 to go into the towns of Samaria, but 4:40 indicates that Jesus stayed two days in this Samaritan town, a fact that emphasises the unexpected nature of the Johannine description of the scene.

When Jesus sees the woman at the well, *he* addresses her, thus demonstrating a willingness to get in contact with her despite the described conflict between the two groups. In 4:5, the text takes us back to patriarchal history (Gen 12ff), to the place where Abraham stayed on his arrival in Palestine (Gen 12:6) and where Jacob once had bought some land (Gen 33:18–20). Thus, the history in John is also presented as common Samaritan-Jewish field, not only as a conflict. The common background may have been further strengthened by the reference to Jacob (as the woman in 4:12 asks μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰακώβ κτλ.) At the end of the passage (Jn 4:42) their common present situation is clearly presented with the statement that Jesus is the saviour of the world (ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου).

The dialogue is also presented by the author as a true dialogue (understood as including both giving and taking), with a declared opposition and a termination of this opposition (cf. Barrett 1972). In 4:11–14, the woman addresses Jesus in second person singular (ἔχεις) and presents the opposition between them by using the expression σὺ εἶ. At the same time the author presents Jesus as defending his own position by using the expression ἐγὼ δώσω. However, the first person versus second person opposition ('you-I') is dissolved in a synthesis by the reference to a third person singular in the expression ὃς δ' ἂν πίνη ('whoever drinks' 4:14a). The same opposition is presented in 4:21–23, but now with plural references. Likewise, the opposition ὑμεῖς and ἡμεῖς is suspended by the use of third person plural reference in οἱ ἀληθινοί. This move from 'we' and 'you' to 'they' may be called a third alternative, and this alternative presents a suspension of the opposition between the two groups initially described. The common presence (the worship in spirit and truth) and past (the background story of the well) point in the same direction towards a dissolved opposition.

The presentation of the opposition and the conclusion is also evident thematically in the statement about the place of worship in 4:21. Jesus argues here in the same dialectical way, on the one side there is Gerizim, on the other side Jerusalem, and both are disregarded in a way. In 4:23, the new principle is presented, at first seemingly replacing the others (cf. ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστίν, ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ). The use of ἀλλά indicates the new turn and a possible solution. This new order or principle, spirit and truth, is presented in opposition to Jerusalem and Gerizim and therefore suspends that conflict. When the woman is convinced and becomes a witness to the other Samaritans and when some of them declare that Jesus is the 'saviour of the world' (4:42), the suspension is completed.

This suspension of a presented conflict seems in the first instance to be in contrast with many other unsolved conflicts presented in the Gospel. There is a general and unsolved presented conflict in 1:11, and in 8:44ff the effect of the encounter with the 'Jews' is seen in the wish to stone Jesus (8:59). In addition, the dialogue with Nicodemus in Jn 3 ends in a judgement (3:19–21), and the confrontation described in Jn 9 between Jesus and the man born blind on the one side and the Pharisees or 'Jews' on the other, also leads

to presentation of the 'judgement' (9:39), and thus also remains unsolved. Barrett (1978:92) too, concludes that great controversies and conflicts between Jesus and the audience often end in division, such as the passages mentioned above. Similarly, the termination of the opposition in 4:1–42 is not a solution on equal terms, demonstrated by the statements concerning the initial ignorance of the Samaritans (4:22). The explicit Jewish tradition has preference over the Samaritan, the salvation still comes 'from the Jews'.

Earlier, I have pointed to the fact that the destruction of the temple in 70 CE did not end hopes of a new temple. Therefore, the message from the passage does not only reflect the situation of the community after the destruction of the temple, of a temple already *passé*, but it also reveals something about the relationship of the community towards the temple institution as a current reality. In order to grasp the meaning of 4:21, 23 for the community (on the second level of drama analysis), we shall have to combine the two insights: the sense of detachment from the temple and the acceptance of it at the same time. On the one side, the place for worship of the Father is declared to be uninteresting (4:21, 23). On the other side, the temple is not abrogated tout court. We cannot simply conclude by saying that the members of the Johannine community did *not* support the temple. Even if the worship of the Father is made independent of place according to Jn 4, the temple of Jerusalem could still be a place where the members thought one should worship. What would they have, for instance, done if the temple were reconstructed?

The relationship towards the Samaritan traditions, including the worship at Gerizim, is, on the other hand, further qualified, as 4:22 favours an interpretation that the Jewish traditions had a special value (cf. ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ οἶδαμεν, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν). The Samaritan woman is invited to join the belief in Jesus as Messiah (4:25–26). When Jesus here indirectly declares himself to be the Messiah (4:26) and many Samaritans comes to believe in him (4:39, 41–42), the Samaritans as a group are also in principle given the status 'invited'. The story of Samaritans in Jn 4 presents to us a direct and immediate invitation to believe in Jesus. This invitation is extended to a group, that is, in the same passage, declared to have remained outside the adherents of the Jerusalem temple.

To sum up, in the investigation of the Johannine story about the encounter of Jesus with the Samaritans five characteristics have been accentuated from my sociological and second level point of view:

1. Groups presented: two groups are presented as distinct groups, the Jews and the Samaritans (4:7 and 4:9).
2. Conflicts presented: the subject of the conflicts between these two groups is presented (4:9b and 4:20).
3. Interrelated descriptions: both groups are described by the other side (4:9a and 4:22).
4. Presented group-boundaries are dissolved: the meeting is described as an unusual meeting, which indicates that the group boundaries are dissolved (4:23–24, 42).
5. Temple link: there is a stated connection between the temple issue and the relationship to ‘outsiders’ (4:20–24).

These features shall be discussed in connection with the other passages that mention possible named ‘outsiders’ for the community. It is a set of sociological information that may be represented as forming a matrix. This matrix is not found elsewhere in connection with the mentioning of ‘others’ in the Gospel of John, as shall be demonstrated below.

7.2.3 *A Gentile Roman?*

The Romans are mentioned specifically in Jn 11:48 as a military threat (see also the analysis of my Caiaphas-prophecy in Jn 11). The only Gentile that we are certain that Jesus addresses in the Gospel of John is Pilate (Jn 18; 19), but the role of the Roman Pilate is not characteristic for the general Johannine attitude towards ‘outsiders’.¹⁸ However, immediately after the Samaritan story in Jn 4, a new ‘outsider’ figure and potential Gentile enters the scene, the *basilikos*, the ‘royal official’ or ‘nobleman’ (4:46–47).¹⁹ He begs Jesus to

¹⁸ Even Frey (1994:230), who maintains that the Gospel’s addressees were mainly Gentiles, admits that the role assigned to Pilate does not indicate any belief in Jesus and that the reference to the sign on the cross, ‘INRI’, could be ironic. On the discussion of the general relationship and attitudes towards Gentiles in Jewish sources, see the discussion of E. P. Sanders (1985:212ff) and my discussion in connection with the Qumran evidence below.

¹⁹ In the New Testament, the adjective βασιλικός is used only as a noun in the

heal his son (4:49). To judge whom John has in mind is difficult, however, not to mention what it meant to the members of the Johannine community. The man is not further described. It is not described what kind of royal service he had. It is not said whether he was a Jew or Gentile. Is there any hidden symbolism that may help to understand the passage?²⁰ The narration of an encounter of Jesus with a possible Gentile may be illustrative for the attitudes of the Johannine community as seen from the second level of drama analysis, and I shall therefore focus on the discussion of his possible Gentile status.

Several scholars argue that he was Gentile. Schnackenburg (1971a:497) thinks that if he was a soldier he was 'most probably' a Gentile ('wäre wohl dann ein Heide'). Hoskyns (1947:261) argues that the notion is 'probably' referring to the same as in the Synoptics. Matthew and Luke present a similar story with only some minor disagreement with John's story, such as the use of *ἐκατοντάρχης* or *ἐκατόνταρχος* instead of *βασιλικός* (Mt 8:5, 8, 15; Lk 7:2, 6). In Matthew, the theme of identity is adopted as Jesus declares that he has not found such faith in Israel (Mt 8:10) and the metaphorical declaration that the 'heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness' (Mt 8:12), which indicates that the author refers to a Gentile. In John, no such qualification is presented and the status of the *βασιλικός* is not even brought into discussion.

In a detailed study, Wegner (1985) presents the different possibilities for the reference of *βασιλικός* and *ἐκατοντάρχης*. He sees four likely solutions for the meaning of the noun *βασιλικός* (1985:57–60):

1. It refers to a person of royal blood, but in these cases mostly used together with *γένος*,²¹
2. it refers more generally to persons in royal service or household,²²

Gospel of John; elsewhere it is used to denote something of royal property or origin, see Acts 12:20–21; Jas 2:8. The variation *βασιλίσκος* ('princelet', a diminutive of *βασιλεύς*) in D (fifth century), is most probably secondary, see Barrett (1978:247).

²⁰ Schlatter (1975:136–137) argues that the *basilikos* story describes how difficult it is for 'power holders' to approach Jesus.

²¹ Particularly seen in Josephus, e.g. Bell. 4:140–141, but he also refers to Aeschylus Prometheus 869 and to Plato Politicus 279a.

²² Josephus Bell. 5:474; 7:105 and Plutarch Solon 27.

3. as in Josephus it often refers to a soldier of the Herodian king or the emperor himself,²³ or
4. as in papyri it may refer to a royal scribe ὁ βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς.²⁴

The synoptic ἑκατοντάρχης is a military notion, often translated with 'centurion', although the figure 100 was not always taken literally (Wegner 1985:61). The discussion of how the two notions interrelate has been essential in the discussion of the story and the evaluation of the inherent theology in the Johannine passage. I think the main criteria for a judgement should derive from the Gospel of John itself since a general direct connection between the Synoptics and John cannot just be taken for granted. Wegner (1985:72) also concludes, concerning the relationship of the terms between the gospels, that 'eine sichere Entscheidung in dieser Frage nicht mehr möglich [ist]'. He supports a common theory: that the mentioning of the βασιλικός refers to a soldier of Herod Antipas, but that the author in either case could have either a Gentile or a Jew in mind.²⁵

Mead (1985) argues that one need *not* assume that the βασιλικός of 4:46–53 is a Jew. He points to the fact that Roman emperors were called 'kings' in the Eastern provinces and that it was not improbable that Roman troops from time to time were stationed in Capernaum or passed through client states when travelling between Syria and Judaea in e.g. diplomatic missions to Herodian courts or even visited them on leave. Besides, we shall have to consider the fact that Jews were exempt from service in the Roman army. Nevertheless, there could be Jews among them, and the determination of this reference therefore remains unsure.²⁶ A common judgement is therefore that the evangelist after all does not really seem to take any interest in whether the basilikos is a Jew or not (see Schnackenburg 1971a:498; Carson 1991:238; Frey 1994:230).

²³ Josephus Bell. 1:45; 2:52, 55, 58 etc.; Vita 400, 402.

²⁴ Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 3:513. In this last example, the word βασιλικός is an adjective and grammatically a variant of example 1., cf. the expression in Acts 12:20–21; Jas 2:8.

²⁵ See also Barrett (1978:247). Hengel (1993:128, n. 108) comes to the same conclusion, supported by Frey (1994:230).

²⁶ Mead (1985:70) points out that 'it need not follow that there were no Jews among the [Roman] units just discussed, or at any rate no Galileans, no Samaritans, no more or less hellenized Jews'.

Even more interesting than conclusions drawn from analogies in the New Testament, Josephus, and other writers, is the discussion of how John elaborates the possible outsider-theme indicated by the notion in the entire Jn 4.

Moloney (1993:183) contends that the βασιλικός has to be a Gentile as the problem of his status 'does not occur to the implied reader of the Fourth Gospel', but this is a solution that assumes what is to be demonstrated. He argues that there is a shift of focus in this passage from Jn 4, and even if Jesus returns to the Jewish Cana, the non-Jewish world is still present in the person of the βασιλικός. 'Arriving at v. 46 the reader accepts this figure from Capernaum, a town where a military presence was called for, as a Gentile' Moloney further argues. The problem with this argument is again that the question of whether the βασιλικός is a Jew or not is never explicitly mentioned in John. When the text does not reveal whether a person is Jewish or not, we cannot simply argue that he is, or that this comprehension seems to have been the comprehension of an implied reader, whose identity is just as uncertain.

It may of course *not* be accidental that the story about the βασιλικός and his son immediately succeeds the story about the Samaritans in Jn 4. These stories are both stories of persons defined as standing outside the circle of believers in Jesus. Since the Samaritans obviously were not temple worshippers of the Jerusalem temple and are explicitly presented as having another place of worship, and since these stories are placed together, this could also indicate that the royal official was of a similar category for the community. The two stories are nevertheless quite different both in form and subject. It is reported that Jesus now had left Samaria and returned to Galilee (4:43). When John marks a shift of place, it means that Jesus once again is located among temple-adherents, see the statement concerning these Galileans in 4:45: καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν.

Further, there is a stated connection between the βασιλικός story and the mentioning of the Galileans in 4:45ff. The presentation of the Galileans in 4:46 may be understood as a presentation of Jesus' further move into Galilee when we compare this move with the declarations of 4:43–45, and/or these verses could be regarded as a general introduction to the following βασιλικός story in 4:46–54. In one way then, the βασιλικός may be one of the persons representing the temple-adherent Galileans. This observation is further reinforced by the note in 4:48 reporting that Jesus was rebuking those who

only believe when they see 'signs and wonders'. The βασιλικός is probably regarded as one of these persons who are rebuked, seen by the use of the plural of εἶδον (see Schlatter 1975:137). The Galileans reported in 4:43–45 also came to belief by seeing and hearing what Jesus had done in Jerusalem, a fact that could include them in the group of those who must see signs and wonders in order to believe (cf. the beatitude in 20:29). 4:43–45 explains the popularity of Jesus, which again explains why the βασιλικός now came to him with his acute problem.

There are two arguments for not seeing the βασιλικός as a Jewish Galilean. The exact words σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα are not used in connection with the Galileans in 4:43–45, and John does not report that these Galileans actually came to believe in Jesus. Nevertheless, 4:45 does say that the Galileans welcomed Jesus (cf. ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι), which must be looked upon as a kind of acceptance and the Galileans' belief in him might also be indicated by the general note in 2:23, a passage that also refers to Jesus' signs (σημεῖα). The interest of the βασιλικός in Jesus does not say much about the attitude of the βασιλικός towards the temple, of course. In any case, he is not rejected by Jesus. His first interest in Jesus is not approved according to 4:48 as he is in need of seeing a miracle to believe, but in the end he too turns out to be a true believer, as reported in 4:50—in a similar manner to the descriptions of the Samaritans in 4:42.

There are also several reasons to believe that the story about the βασιλικός is not meant to function similarly to the Samaritan story. There are no thematic nor any formal links to the preceding story, the βασιλικός story is a story about healing and the power of Jesus and the effect of a sign, not about worship—which is one of the main topics in the conversation between the Samaritan woman and Jesus. The belief expressed by the official is not the belief in Jesus as the saviour of the world, although this may be an intended final effect expressed in 4:53b (cf. καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη).

Moreover, in a more detailed comparison with the scheme or matrix constructed on the basis of the Samaritan story, there are several other observations that speak against the theory saying that the βασιλικός story functions to break boundaries for the Johannine community:

1. The potential group (Gentile Roman) is not presented as a group, but through a title of an individual representative, *τις βασιλικός*, in the initial phrase of the story *καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικὸς οὗ ὁ υἱὸς ἡσθένει ἐν Καφαρναούμ* (4:46). Jesus is not presented as a 'Jew'.
2. No fundamental disagreements or conflicts are presented between the *βασιλικός* and Jesus or by meta-commentaries except the rebukes of Jesus regarding this kind of faith. Jesus addresses his reproach, not to the *βασιλικός* alone, but seemingly to all the persons like him by using the 2nd person plural of *ὁράω* and *πιστεύω*. The *βασιλικός* is therefore also presented as an outsider, belonging to a group that needs signs to believe: 'You!', Jesus says and includes the *βασιλικός* (4:48). Whether Jewish or not, the status of this group cannot be inferred from this passage alone. Compared to the meeting with the Samaritan woman, the meeting with the *βασιλικός* lacks the deep conflict presentation.
3. There are no negative characteristics concerning the one group, e.g. as being ignorant. Jesus does reproach the *βασιλικός*, but the reproach is in the same category as the reproach of Thomas in 20:25–29. Although the starting point was not perfect, the *βασιλικός* nevertheless turns out to be a true adherent of Jesus, according to John.
4. There are no indications that this is an unusual meeting, as is the case with the meeting between Jesus and the Samaritan woman.
5. The temple or cultus aspect is present as introductory remarks (the Galilean audience is described as having participated at the festival), but it is not employed or referred to in the passage in any way.

However, there are some important similarities between the two stories in Jn 4. There is an invitation to believe in Jesus when the author first presents Jesus as reproaching the man, but then describes how he, after all, performs a sign claimed by the *βασιλικός*. By granting the sign, *John* accepts the *βασιλικός* and reports that he came to believe in the word of Jesus (4:50, 53). The official's status remains unsure, but the story nevertheless presents Jesus as one who performs a wonder so that the *βασιλικός* and his household could

come to believe (4:53). There is no deep conflict presented that needs to be resolved or confronted, only critique followed by a sign that sociologically may have functioned as or may reflect an invitation from the Johannine community not only to different royal servants, but to anyone hearing the story.

Apart from the passage presenting the Samaritan encounter, this is a combination of 1. a description of a person or persons not coming from the inner circles of believers in Jesus, and 2. an evident lack of interest in their identity or status. This combination is in fact a distinguishing mark for all the designations of ‘outsiders’ (including the Greeks and other anonymous groups in John, see below).

7.2.4 *Gentile Greeks?*

The next possible reference to ‘outsiders’ is in the mentioning of οἱ Ἕλληνες (Greeks or Hellenists), twice in Jn 7:35 and once in 12:20.²⁷ Again, I shall analyse the function of the story in the Johannine community from the particular angle and matrix described in connection with the Samaritan and the βασιλικός encounter. It is interesting that from this perspective we may observe that all the passages in which the notion occurs include temple references: the declarations concerning the Ἕλληνες are uttered *in* the temple (7:28), *during* the festival of Booths (7:1), and *in connection with* a pilgrimage to worship in Jerusalem (12:20). Similarly to the βασιλικός story, the temple connection is not further explained or employed in the subsequent Johannine discussions, thus its value is reduced as a presentation of attitudes in the Johannine community.

The use of Ἕλληνες in other texts and in the context of Jn 7 and 12 does not help much to explain either the meaning or the reference of the notion in these passages. The word has several references and even more meanings and from a Jewish point of view; it could be applied to Gentile proselytes (Acts 17:4 and Josephus Bell. 7:45), not just to a person of Greek language and culture (Bauer 1979:251–252). Acts 21:37, Rom 1:14 and Gal 2:3 are passages with such a technical use referring to people speaking Greek or taking

²⁷ Ἕλλην, Ἑλληνικός, Ἑλληνίς, Ἑλληνιστής, Ἑλληνιστί (‘Greek’) occur once in the Synoptics (Mk 7:26 Ἑλληνίς), 4 times in John and 28 times in the rest of the New Testament (Acts particularly), cf. Accordance (2000).

part in the Greek culture (Fredouille 1986:1118). In most cases, the notion refers to non-Jews.

The passage embodying the notion in Jn 7 deals with a Johannine misunderstanding containing three features:

1. Jesus declares that he is soon to leave the 'Jews' (7:34).
2. The audience finds this saying to be enigmatic (7:35).
3. The stated enigmatic saying of 7:34 is not only indirectly explained as a riddle through the audience's stated ignorance, the text also declares that the statement in fact was unclear for them (7:36).²⁸

By referring to this reaction from the audience, a double-meaning emerges, probably pointing towards the death and resurrection of Jesus. This is evident because there are analogous statements in the Gospel referring to these events (see 8:21ff; 13:33, 36; 14:2ff; 16:16ff that all express a similar double-meaning and in all cases with a subsequent misunderstanding by the 'Jews' or one of the disciples).²⁹

In opposition to misunderstandings expressed elsewhere, the double-meaning in Jn 7 remains unclear in the first instance (Leroy 1968). Both the misunderstanding of the temple-saying in 2:20, and the misunderstanding of Nicodemus in 3:4 are corrected by the author and explained. Jesus explains to the Samaritan woman why he does not need a vessel (4:11ff). The meaning of Jesus' statement that he already had food is also explained to the disciples in 4:31–34. In 6:32ff, Jesus elucidates what the true bread from heaven is: ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς (6:35). In 6:51–58, he explains what it means to eat his flesh. After the enigmatic words in 8:21, the explanations follow in 8:23 and Peter's question in 13:36 leads him to an explanatory dialogue with Jesus. In 8:36ff, Jesus very explicitly tells the 'Jews' in what way they cannot be σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, since they do not do what Abraham was doing. In 8:51ff, it is also explained why Jesus is greater than Abraham: πρὶν Ἀβραάμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.

The double entendre of 7:35–36 can only be explained as a misunderstanding when we consider the hidden allusions and by

²⁸ For a general treatment of misunderstandings, see the comments above and Leroy (1968); Vouga (1977); Brown (1979:61–62).

²⁹ See Bultmann (1971:127, n. 1; 308, n. 6); Hoskyns (1947:319, 335ff et al.); Brown (1966:CXXXV, 349 et al.); Carson (1991:320).

drawing in the explanation in 8:21ff: ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί κτλ. (8:23). What the 'Jews' say in 7:35–36 is neither corrected nor explained within the nearest context and it could therefore be looked upon as an accepted view and not as a misunderstanding tout court. An interpretation of the passage does not, however, take us any further, and the problem of the identity of the Greeks referred to in 7:35 remains, since the interpretation still hinges upon the reference and meaning of Ἑλληνες on the second level. The explanations in 8:21ff show that the 'Jews' did misunderstand Jesus. He was in fact speaking about a place where these 'Jews' could not find him since he is 'from above' (ἐκ τῶν ἄνω). Nevertheless, it is also indicated that Jesus wanted to go the Ἑλληνες and teach them, also indicating the attitude of the members of the Johannine community.

In Jn 7, one expression must be explained in addition to the notion Ἑλληνες itself, i.e. the expression ἡ διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων. In 7:35, ἡ διασπορά most probably refers to places where Jews lived abroad and the whole expression should be translated 'the Diaspora among the Greeks'.³⁰ Nothing is said about their attitudes towards the temple. The second time (cf. μέλλει πορεύεσθαι καὶ διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἑλληνας) the notion is mentioned, however, it is even more ambiguous as it also lacks the further specification 'Diaspora' and therefore could refer not only to Greek-speaking Jews but to Gentiles alike. So the main question is whether the reference of ἡ διασπορά τῶν Ἑλλήνων in the first part of the sentence corresponds to οἱ Ἑλληνες at the end of 7:35.

A consideration of the next passage in which this notion occurs (12:20) is often used to help clarify both meaning and reference in the Gospel (Barrett 1978:326). In 12:20, the notion Ἑλληνες is in fact defined more exactly: ἦσαν δὲ Ἑλληνές τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. Their national identity is hidden, so John could have had both Greek speaking Jews and non-Jews in mind (Robinson 1960:120; Barrett 1978:421). What is evident, however, is that they had been going up to Jerusalem (ἀναβαίνω) in

³⁰ According to Blass and Debrunner (1965:§166) ('Diaspora unter Griechen'), see also Barrett (1978:325). The discussion of the various alternatives is presented in Frey (1994:249–250, n. 89). Grammatically it corresponds to the expression διασπορά Πόντου in 1 Pet 1:1.

order to worship (ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν), and on a very special occasion, the festival (cf. ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ) of Passover (referring to 12:1 πρὸ ἐξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα). In the subsequent passage, the Ἕλληνες disappear totally, if they are not alluded to and included in the meaning of Jesus' expression πολλὸν καρπὸν φέρω (12:46), the expression πάντες³¹ in 12:32 (κἀγὼ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντα ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἑμαυτόν) and introduced by κόσμος already in 12:19. The focus of the remaining passage is turned towards Jesus and his glorification (7:23ff) and away from the worshipping Greeks and the temple. The focus shifts in a way that makes intended connections between these two features dubious. What is certain is that the Greeks in Jn 12:20 *are* described as worshippers and therefore temple adherents, while the determination of their identity seems to be rather uninteresting for the author.³²

This means that the stated references to Ἕλληνες in John are of two kinds. Jn 7:35 is ambiguous concerning ethnic status, but it has a possible reference to temple adherents; 12:20, on the other hand, clearly refers to temple adherents. This means that if they were Gentiles, they were God-fearing or proselytes.³³ The statements may of course reflect a later Gentile mission to proselytes.³⁴ Both in 7:35 and 12:20 the text presents the practice as accepted by temple Judaism, independent of whether this was a common practice or not. The notion is therefore not presented as a breaking of any relationships with temple Judaism. On the contrary, this potential mission is described by John as in accordance with temple Judaism,

³¹ Some manuscripts use πάντα ('everything'), see P⁶⁶ N* (f D) pc latt; Ir^{lat}, Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos et al. (1993).

³² Frey (1994) thinks that the notion in the second part of Jn 7:35 refers to Gentile Greeks, but he admits that there is a relative vagueness in this expression. It is exactly this vagueness that is the key to understanding the communicative function of this passage and of Jn 12:20, he argues. He declares himself to be in accordance with Dodd (1953:271) who differentiated between the reference of the notion (i.e. proselytes) and its meaning (i.e. the great world at large).

³³ Carson (1991:436) presents these alternatives. Since one cannot find conclusive arguments in either direction in the Gospel of John in this matter, he refers to God-fearing Gentiles in Acts, see Acts 8:27 (the Ethiopian eunuch) and Acts 10 (Cornelius).

³⁴ See Carson (1991:320, 435–436) and Barrett (1978:421) who concludes that the notion itself points towards a Gentile church to which John and his readers belonged. Dahl (1962:126) contends that Jn 12:20ff indicates the universal mission that is to be inaugurated by the death of Jesus.

since these Ἕλληνες are already presented as temple adherents, whether these were proselytes or not. However, I find it difficult to see that the mention of these Ἕλληνες indicates a Gentile missionary activity in the community of John similar to one reported at some places in the Synoptics, in Acts and by Paul.

The link to the cultus in Jn 7 is in one way established by the mention of the temple and the festival of the Booths. This link is, however, not elaborated as was the case with the Samaritan encounter. In addition, the dialogues are not reported to have taken place at or near the temple; the location does not seem to be of particular interest. The expression 'to teach the Greeks' (διδάσκειν τοὺς Ἕλληνας), although not further qualified, is nevertheless a possible temple connection since the teaching of Jesus often took place in the temple (7:14; 8:2, 20; 18:20) and since he twice is said to have taught about the temple and the worship (2:19; 4:21). This means that although the meaning of the word Ἕλληνες is ambiguous, it may reflect an interest in going to the Diaspora and in teaching there, but again, this interest is presented as an already existing part of temple Judaism.

Compared to the matrix of the conflict and its termination in the Samaritan story of Jn 4, the references to the Ἕλληνες in John are vague and the analysis remains unsure about the meaning on the second drama level, the level of the community. As was the case with βασιλικός, both the meaning and the reference of the notion in itself and in relation to the cultus-theme are ambiguous. Any meaning of the notion indicating a Gentile mission has to be inferred from what is *not* said. In 12:20, where the meaning is expressed, it is revealed that Greeks are coming to Jesus, and are thus 'outsiders', i.e. possibly representing people outside the close followers of Jesus and thus presumably also the Johannine community. In both cases, a connection is established, either from Jesus to them (7:35) or from them to Jesus (12:20).

My investigation suggests that John has not employed this term to demonstrate an opposition and solution similar to the opposition and solution found in the Samaritan conflict. The Ἕλληνες is specified to be temple-adherents supporting the temple institution in some way and the announced teaching to these Greeks is a teaching within the reign of temple Judaism.

7.2.5 *The 'Other Sheep'?*

The expression 'other sheep' in the phrase καὶ ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης in Jn 10:16, is one of several encoded notions about possible 'outsiders' in the Gospel and it is a puzzle that passes unexplained. The literal meaning and Old Testament/Tanak background seem unproblematic to reconstruct. Terms for 'flock' may have an Old Testament/Tanak background as it is often used to denote Israel.³⁵ In addition, the sheep has a cultic connotation as sacrificial animal, a well-known metaphor for John (the Lamb of God). The reference of the transferred metaphorical meaning in this passage is, however, much more difficult to decide upon from the passage alone, and the actual reference on both levels of analysis is an even more difficult task to reconstruct historically.³⁶ The main difficulty in the passage is what the *other* sheep refer to (10:16).

The notion is part of the only Johannine parable-like passage that includes an explanation, or one should say, a kind of interpretation. In this case, the explanation does not help us much. According to 9:40, the addressees on the first level of analysis are the Pharisees, but the subject of the passage changes so abruptly at the beginning of Jn 10, that a general reader cannot be excluded, e.g. the 'Jews' referred to in 10:19. Parts of the initial story or figure of speech (ἡ παροιμία 10:1–5) are then presumably explained in the subsequent text. Jesus is said to be both the 'gate' (cf. ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα, 10:9) and the 'good shepherd' (cf. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, 10:11).

The gate-theme doesn't correspond very well to the initial story and seems only associatively added, while the shepherd-theme is more in correspondence with it. The two explanations are linked by the mentioning of the dangers on the one side and the good care on the other. The thieves and bandits referred to in 10:8, 10 represent the danger in the first explanation, as does the hired hand. The

³⁵ See Jer 13:17; Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:31; Mic 7:14; Zech 10:3; Pss 79:13; 95:7; 100:3. God as shepherd is found in Pss 23; 28:9; 68:8–9; 74:1; Jer 23:2; Ezek 34:11–12; Isa 40:10–11; 49:9; Mic 4:6–7. See Bultmann (1971:384, n. 2).

³⁶ A difficulty is raised by the $\mathfrak{P}^{66}$ that reads συναγαγεῖν instead of ἀγαγεῖν in Jn 10:16b. Should we read 'gather' or 'lead'? Meeks (1967:318) and Martyn (1978:118) argue against Schnackenburg (1971b:ad loc.) that συναγαγεῖν is to be preferred partly because the unifying meaning in the last part of the verse supports this reading: 'So there will be one flock, one shepherd'. The solution of Schnackenburg is, however, commendable. As ἀγαγεῖν does not correspond to the last part, a later correction is most probable.

hired hand (ὁ μισθωτός) and the wolf (ὁ λύκος) mentioned in 10:12, 13 represent the danger in the last explanation. It is difficult to see what these notions refer to concretely on both levels and suffice it to say that there is a general threat. At the final stage of the gospel writing, the sheep may be the 'Jews' or other Johannine Christians, the ἀλλότριος (10:5 singular and plural use), κλέπται καὶ λησταί (10:1, 8, 10) and λύκος (10:12) may represent dangers lurking in a Greco-Roman city or within the synagogue, and the μισθωτός may be other Gentile leaders or secretly believing 'rulers', as Martyn (1978:116) argues.

The reference to the notion 'other sheep' is just as uncertain and cannot be said to definitely refer to any particular group or individual. There are three common but different solutions to the problem:³⁷

1. The most common interpretation is that John announces a new and particularly Christian attitude towards Gentile 'outsiders'.³⁸
2. The expression may also refer to hellenised Jews outside Palestine, as pointed out by Robinson (1962:114–115) and Carson (1991:390).
3. Martyn (1978:115) and Brown (1979:90) see the notion in relation to what they consider to be the Jewish surrounding of John and Brown argues that the 'other sheep' were other Apostolic Christians.

For a study of social characteristics of the community, I shall argue that the reference of the expression has only a limited value since the interpretations are too dependent on the scholar's view of the gospel's general address, which is also the issue in question here.³⁹ The fact that there are several plausible solutions only accentuates the insecure nature of these interpretations.

³⁷ The meaning of 'others' in Jn 4:38b ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε may be drawn, but the reference is also quite uncertain, cf. the discussion in Robinson (1959).

³⁸ Dahl (1962:137); Bultmann (1971:383); Barrett (1978:376); Schnackenburg (1971b ad loc.); Lindars (1972:363); Carson (1991:390); Frey (1994:249).

³⁹ Barrett (1978:376) argues that the αὐλή is Israel. Christ has some sheep in the αὐλή of Judaism and some who are not of that αὐλή, that is Gentiles. The reason is ultimately that 'John was written in the context of the Gentile mission'. Carson (1991:390) simply rejects Martyn's overall theory as 'both needlessly anachronistic and hopelessly speculative' and argues in a very simple way, I think, that the category presupposed by the expression is Gentile.

Some conclusions are nevertheless quite obvious. That the sheep are believers in Jesus is also obvious since he says that he is willing to die for the sheep (10:11, 15). The expression ἄλλα πρόβατα (10:16) therefore points to other believers in Christ, but of another kind and in some way contrasting the sheep in the fold of the shepherd Jesus.⁴⁰ The Caiaphas-prophecy in Jn 11 is another passage that also speaks of others 'that are spread around'. The expression does not occur in a metaphorical context, but there is a correspondence that must be considered. Martyn (1978:117) sees a connection between the Caiaphas-prophecy in Jn 11 and this passage in Jn 10 as they are unified by the same two motifs, a unification and a gathering (that leads to the unification reported in 10:16: καὶ γενήσονται μία ποιμνὴ, εἰς ποιμήν). I do not find it improbable that the reason for this unifying imperative is that the believers had actually already been scattered, but there is very little evidence for such an understanding from the metaphor. The sheep that are scattered according to 10:12 (ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει) could be from the flock and herd mentioned in 10:16, where Jesus clearly refers to sheep that do not belong to this flock (πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης). However, we are clearly in need of external points of comparison. Martyn has been accused for relying too much on the Birkat ha-Minim as an external secure source and date for this scattering (see the discussion in chapter 3). But even if this expulsion is not a complete secure external point, it does not indicate that Martyn is wrong in his assertion that the Gospel must be seen as reflecting an expulsion or persecution that caused the scattering of the Johannine Christians.

Frey (1994:245–249) also sees parallels between this passage and the Caiaphas-prophecy, particularly between the soteriological aspects of 10:11 and 11:50 and between the desire for unity expressed in 10:16 and 11:52. He believes that these other sheep must be Gentiles, but again he is relying on a conclusion from an impression of a general detachment from Judaism, which is the question initially posed. Not only is this detachment visible in the use of Ἰουδαῖοι and the

⁴⁰ See also my comments in chapter 3. These expressions could be referring both to individuals and groups, but that is not essential for my analysis. Robinson (1959) argues that the literal meaning clearly refers to individuals, but I cannot see how groups can be excluded.

distant relationship to Jewish laws expressed in phrases like ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι κτλ. (8:17). Frey argues (1994: 231–233) that it is also visible in the explanations of words and names, as well as the detached attitude towards Jewish festivals and customs. However, although the detachment is undeniable, the evaluation of it in a sociological perspective like mine is still uncertain. As in the Samaritan story, we see that two distinct groups are presented, but in this case, both meaning and reference of the metaphors used are highly uncertain, and are by nature even more uncertain than with the mention of the Ἑλλήνες and the Roman official.

For my overall evaluation of the Johannine community, two factors from the above considerations are nevertheless essential in comparison with the social attitudes seen in the Samaritan encounter. First, the uncertainties involved mean that the references to a boundary discussion between Jews and non-Jews are too vague here to be employed as a basis for any serious conclusions. Secondly, it is interesting that the context of the passage has no specific cultus-link and that the term πρόβατα is used as a part of a pastoral metaphor, and not in relation to the cultus in the temple.⁴¹ Again, the willingness by Jesus to accept these ‘outsiders’ is the most significant aspect of the passage as an indirect presentation of the social characteristics of the Johannine community. This aspect of the passage is, in fact, more important than theories about their actual reference.

7.2.6 *The ‘Dispersed Children of God’?*

The encoded and anonymous reference to ‘outsiders’ that is presented in the Caiaphas-prophecy in Jn 11:49–50 and its explanation in 11:51–52 is a reference that also may be studied on its own grounds. The passage employs a terminology that has also been linked to Gentile addressees of the Gospel. The prophecy uses words like λαός and ἔθνος and in the explanation we find the expression τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα (11:52). This notion ‘dispersed children of God’ is used in other Jewish texts to denote Jews in the Diaspora.⁴²

⁴¹ Even the additional qualification of the notion πρόβατα in Mt 10:6 (πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ) referring to the ‘lost sheep of the house of Israel’ is lacking here, and a comparison with the Synoptics does not help us much in making the historical reference(s) of John clearer.

⁴² The traditional meaning of the expression probably refers to the dispersed Israelites (Barrett 1978:407), see e.g. Isa 43:5; Jer 23:2–3; Ezek 34:12; 37:12.

Theoretically, however, there are several possible solutions as seen from the second level of analysis. Could it refer to other Christians—including Gentiles, or could it refer to non-Christian Gentiles alone? The essential question for this analysis concerns the Johannine interpretation of the statement and possible reflections of the Johannine community.

‘The children of God’ is an expression that in 1:12–13 is clearly said to be those who believe in the name of Jesus (cf. ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). Similar metaphors elsewhere may also come into consideration. Barrett (1978:407) compares the expression with the words directed to Nicodemus in 3:3, 5 concerning the new birth (ἄνωθεν) as well as the mentioning of ‘other sheep’ in 10:16 that he connects to a predestined distinction between believers and non-believers both inside and outside (Gentiles) Judaism (Barrett 1978:376). This passage as well as the Johannine wish for unity (17:21) are, however, better understood as a result of an internal conflict of the Johannine Christians. It is thus difficult to see how we may connect these children to Gentiles alone, and to see a polemic towards traditional Jews.

Barrett is probably right when he argues that the Johannine irony nowhere reaches a higher point than in the interpretation of the prophecy in 11:51–52, ‘Jesus was put to death; and (politically) the people perished. Yet he died ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ and those of the nation who believed in him did not perish’. Our passage has a peculiar shift of terminology between λαός and ἔθνος, but it is a common understanding that λαός and ἔθνος are used as synonyms.⁴³ Frey (1994) supports Pancaro (1975:122–125) and contends that λαός and ἔθνος must be given two distinct meanings and the clue to the whole question of the Johannine addressees lies in the interpretation of the Caiaphas-prophecy. The expression λαός in 11:50–51 is thus one of the hidden references to Gentiles in the Gospel (‘verdeckte Hinweise auf ‘die Heiden’ im Johannesevangelium’, Frey 1994:237ff). The interchange of λαός and ἔθνος expresses a subtle nuance, he claims since:

1. The τόπος is defined to be the temple and is linked to ἔθνος which thus becomes a national-political term attached to the temple,

⁴³ See Barrett (1978:407) and Lindars (1972:406). The identification of the ἔθνος as representing temple Judaism, supports my overall understanding of the temple. This is in accordance with Pancaro (1975:125).

2. *λαός* is presented as different from *ἔθνος* because the prophecy by Caiaphas is exposed in 11:51b–52 and thus explains what Caiaphas actually referred to by the two notions, i.e. that Jesus not only died for the national *ἔθνος* including the temple, but also for the *λαός*, which is equivalent to the dispersed people,
3. *λαός* and *ἔθνος* are presented antithetically and both constituted by the sacrificial death of Jesus,
4. the passage has several meanings on different levels, retrospectively from the viewpoint of the narrative moment, and also from a christological and soteriological viewpoint, and
5. the Gospel uses the ambiguity of the term, i.e. it says that Caiaphas was referring to the people of God, while John broadens the perspective—not only did Jesus die for the people referred to by Caiaphas, but also for the new eschatological people of God.

The word *λαός* is used three times in John (8:2; 11:50; 18:14) and particularly the first time it is used it cannot be seen as referring to a Christian community (cf. *παρεγένετο εἰς τὸ ἱερόν καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν*). The easiest solution (i.e. requiring a minimum of additional explanations) is, after all, to see the shift of expression as a way of avoiding a repetition of words. What is particularly problematic with Frey's understanding is nevertheless the identification of the *λαός* with 'Gentiles' (Frey 1994:244). He does not evaluate other possible alternatives, however, such as Diaspora Jews, hellenised Jews, or Gentile proselytes. It seems more natural to me that the alleged expulsion from the synagogue as seen in 9:22 would lead to such a terminology. Like the passages referring to such an expulsion (9:22; 12:42; 16:2), the use of *Ἰουδαῖοι* given in this passage seems late of origin. Frey argues that the Johannine Epistles bear witness to a Gentile milieu, but again such evidence does not speak in favour of any similar conclusion regarding the environment of the Gospel. Frey also rejects the theory of Brown (1979) that the Gospel reveals the history of the community (but does not mention Brown's forerunner Martyn) saying that these observations may be better explained as a result 'aus der Dramaturgie des Evangeliums' (Frey 1994:235). He argues for instance that the dramaturgy of the Gospel shows that by each passage presented, the conflict is aggravated and reaches a climax by the crucifixion. The use of the word *κόσμος* also points in that same direction, according to Frey. A Jewish environment or

an environment dominated by Jews does not seem very close, as he sees it. The most probable background is that the audience belonged to a 'new third family between Jews and Gentiles' he concludes.⁴⁴

Admittedly, Frey points to four common arguments throughout his article that favour a general 'Gentile addressee theory' for the Gospel:

1. The use of Ἰουδαῖοι demonstrates that the reader was not Jewish (the ejection from the synagogue is too general and is traditional material known also from other New Testament writings),
2. the presented information demonstrates that the reader (or at last some of them) only knew Greek,
3. the explanation of Aramaic words demonstrates that the intended reader did not know much Hebrew, and
4. the references to 'their' laws, festivals and customs show the distance between them (Frey 1994:231ff).

On the other hand, there is also evidence of familiarity with Jewish traditions, scripture and much of the information is given in a non-polemic way. Evidently, there are signs in the Gospel of both knowledge of Jewish tradition as well as lack of such knowledge (Frey 1994:232–233).

Against the arguments of Frey, we may observe that the detached attitude assigned to the use of Ἰουδαῖος and the detachment indicated by the use of the second and the third person in the addressing of the 'Jews', are at best *indications* that the intended audience is non-Jewish. Describing a group that we belong to ourselves by using an external designation is, after all, quite common ('all Cretans lie, the Cretan said', see Titus 1:12). Philo may use the word Ἰουδαῖος in a similar way, not only in his politico-historical treatises *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, but also in treatises that are parts of the *Exposition of the Law* (Dahl 1963:107). In *Mos.* 1:1, Philo describes Moses as a Ἰουδαῖος, and John similarly describes Jesus to be a 'Jew' in 4:9. In other words, it is possible for temple-critical Jews like Philo to use the same phrasing, taking the outside standpoint of

⁴⁴ Cf. the phrase '[ein neues drittes Geschlecht] zwischen Juden und Heiden' (Frey 1994:237).

a narrator describing Jewish customs as if he were not a Jew himself. The 'implied author' is the one stating that Jesus was a Jew.⁴⁵ Philo does not, on the other hand, use the notion of Ἰουδαῖος in a similar negative way as in Jn 8. In 8:44, the 'Jews' are described as having the Devil as their father (cf. ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν), but these 'Jews' are at the same time described as 'Jews' that believed in Jesus according to 8:31.⁴⁶

The wording can therefore not be taken as a general dismissal of 'Jews' and Jewish traditions. The entire passage contains nothing of the dynamic Samaritan encounter. Not only is Jesus described as a 'Jew' in John, but his opponents are described as 'Jews' as well. However, even if the meaning and reference of the expressions 'the dispersed children of God' and the shifting use of notion (λαός against ἔθνος) cannot be properly defined, the explanation of the Caiaphas prophecy in 11:51–52 is still marked by a friendly attitude towards outsiders.

7.2.7 *'Jews' in the Temple and the Synagogue*

In chapter 3, I argued against the criticism of Martyn's understanding (1968 et al.) of the ejection from the synagogue reflected in 9:22, 12:42 and 16:2 and concluded that the best way to understand the strange use of the notion 'Jews' in the Fourth Gospel is still to see it in some way connected with this expulsion. In this perspective, John is anti-Jewish. In any case, 'Jews' cannot generally be regarded as 'outsiders' on the first level of analysis, but in accordance with this theory, some of them are presented as opponents to Jesus. Without going into an overall discussion of anti-Judaism in the Gospel, I shall study the role of these 'Jews' as 'outsiders' in the community and the effects of the alleged expulsion on John's relationship to the temple as institution.

⁴⁵ In order to focus the investigation on a social scientific perspective, I shall not follow this way of literary analysis. My point here is only to show that there are theoretical reflections articulated that make this division obvious. The real author uses a narratee as rhetorical device, often by using a character in the story (Culpepper 1987:15–18).

⁴⁶ Brown (1979:73ff) calls this group 'The Jewish Christians churches of inadequate faith'. For that reason it can hardly be used as an argument for anti-Judaism in John, cf. Bieringer, Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (2001b:4).

The synagogue and the temple are connected in 18:20 where Jesus declares that he has said nothing in secret but spoken openly in the synagogue *as well as* in the temple, using his appearances in these institutions as attestation. While the Synoptics report that Jesus acted as a teacher several different places, including the synagogue and the temple, Jesus, as presented by John, only teaches in the synagogue (ἡ συναγωγή) and the temple (τὸ ἱερόν).⁴⁷ It is reported here that Jesus defends himself against the questions from the high priest concerning his teaching, by pointing to two contemporary institutions of public domain. Jesus claims that as long as he had been performing publicly, no one could accuse him of teaching secretly. His activities at the synagogue are also reported in Jn 6 (see above). This reported statement by Jesus in 18:20 demonstrates a connection between temple and synagogue as places for public teaching. The statement also indicates the central position and importance of these institutions by John as he states that these were places where 'Jews' would come together (cf. συνέρχομαι). A similar connection between these two institutions is found in Philo, a fact that strengthens my perspective here.⁴⁸ There are no direct thematic connections between the stories in Jn 2:13–22 and Jn 9. Nevertheless, according to John, Jesus uses both his appearances in the temple *as well as* in the synagogue to argue that he had been teaching in public and thus could not be accused of teaching in secret.

⁴⁷ Jesus teaches (διδάσκει) in Jn 6:59 (in the synagogue) and 7:14, 28; 8:2, 20; 18:20 (in or at the temple), see Pancaro (1975:84).

⁴⁸ In Legat. 191, Philo sees the defence of the synagogues (προσευχαί) in connection with the defence of the Jerusalem temple (ὁ πανίερος sc. τόπος) as Gaius Caligula wanted to erect statues of himself in both kinds of institutions. Williamson (1989:5), based on this paragraph and others, argues that Philo was equally concerned about the desecration of the temple and defilement of the synagogues in Palestine. Despite the difference in terminology between John and Philo (συναγωγή vs. προσευχή) and the difficulties in finding evidence for what a synagogue actually was in the first century (see McKay 1994), there are few reasons to believe that they are not referring to a similar institution, a place at which one might act publicly, either by speaking as Jesus or violating its integrity as Gaius intended to do. Evidence for seeing a connection in attitude towards these two institutions in John is therefore found both internally (18:20) and made historically probable by way of external evidence (Philo Legat. 191). Jn 18:20 suggests in fact that the relationship of John to the synagogue should be linked analytically with the relationship to the temple, and Legat. 191 suggests that the Roman emperor accepted them as well as essential institutions, although negatively—i.e. by trying to destroy them (as the Jews understood the situation).

The two passages may also be connected since the comments in the passages bear witness to a common post-Easter origin. However, there is no indication in John that the community was driven out of the temple or rejected by the temple authorities, while there are strong indications of a rejection by the synagogue authorities. Again, the Johannine Gospel at the final stage most probably refers to a situation when the temple is destroyed, but the statements in John that lead to this conclusion cannot be taken as a proof of John's rejection of the temple institution in toto. In addition, the fact that the text indicates that Christians were pushed out of the synagogue also shows that they had remained loyal to the synagogue in the first instance.⁴⁹ The temple passages and the synagogue passages therefore have in common that *they do not indicate rejections of any of them*. If the synagogue represented Jewish institutions generally, and the synagogue including its practices and beliefs was accepted generally, it is more probable that the temple institution was accepted too. The inherent acceptance of these institutions supports my conclusion above regarding the Johannine attitude in the temple passages concerning replacement and social tension.

Thus, the use of the notion 'Jews' as seen from the background of the expulsion from the synagogue and the criticism of the temple, cannot be taken to be a fundamental rejection of these institutions. This is particularly important for the understanding of the Gospel seen from the second level. Although, the use of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is marked by a detached relationship, it is not an argument for seeing the use of 'Jews' as the final proof of the isolation of the community from their parent body. Compared to what one may call the 'Samaritan matrix' from Jn 4, the main difference is naturally that the conflict with οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is, except from this word, presented as an intra-mural conflict in the literary world of John. Some scholars take the marks of separation between the Johannine community and Judaism too seriously. Culpepper (2001:63) argues that John views the separation from Judaism as a past event. The ejection from the synagogue is certainly a past event, but the Gospel as a whole still

⁴⁹ See Pancaro (1975:493) who also thinks that they 'represented one of the many 'synagogues' within Judaism'. Lieu (1999) argues in the same way: generally, the synagogue is not antithetical to Jesus. She supports Thyen (1980) who argues that the exclusion from the synagogue is not seen as the foundation legend of the Johannine community (Lieu 1999:62, n. 41).

announces a willingness to stay within the parent body. All in all, the Fourth Gospel presents different tensions in relation to its parent body and possible 'outsiders'.

7.3 A VARIETY OF HIGH AND LOW TENSION

In relation to the synagogue, there is certainly a high tension on christological grounds (9:22; 12:42; 16:2). The relationship towards the 'world' in general reveals a mixture of different degrees of tension (e.g. 3:16; 5:19) and the relationship towards named outsiders (coded or not) is partly friendly and partly hostile, independent of their ethnic status. The passages that include a reference to different groups were analysed on the basis of an evaluation of the first encounter with named 'outsiders', the Samaritan encounter. In the analysis of 4:1–42, I concluded that there are five features in the Samaritan encounter that are essential from my point of view and that together form a matrix of relationships. I have applied these as criteria for an evaluation of the expressed relationship in the other passages in which different named 'outsiders' are mentioned.

The investigation has demonstrated that the Samaritan story is unique when it comes to social relationships in John:

1. *Groups presented.* One notion is used to describe a distinct unit over against 'Jews', i.e. the Samaritans. The reference and meaning of the notion 'Greeks' is uncertain, but it is seen as a distinct unit.
2. *Conflicts presented.* The Samaritans (4:1–42) are described as having a conflict concerning the proper place of worship, i.e. Gerizim over against Jerusalem. The royal official (βασιλικός in 4:43–54), the alleged Roman, was accused of having inadequate faith, while the Ἕλληνες (7:35; 12:20) and the 'dispersed children of God' (11:52) are described geographical as 'outsiders' without any specific discussion of their position and situation.
3. *Interrelated descriptions.* Interrelated descriptions are only found in the Samaritan story where the 'Jews' and the Samaritans are defined in relation to each other. In addition, the βασιλικός and the Ἕλληνες are referred to as Jerusalem temple adherents.
4. *Presented groups boundaries dissolved.* Only in the Samaritan story do we find a presented conflict with a subsequent agreement.

5. *Temple link.* In the stories of the Samaritans, the βασιλικός, the Ἑλληνες and the dispersed children of God, these groups are presented with a link to the temple in the context as described above, but this link is elaborated substantially by John only in the Samaritan story.

However, there are also similar features in the Johannine use of notions referring to all ‘outsiders’:

1. The social characteristics of the ‘outsiders’ on the first level of analysis may be described as an interest of the author and presumably also of the Johannine community. In the description we find some temple-adherents, some Samaritans, some Greeks (Ἑλληνες, Gentile proselytes?), and people like the βασιλικός. I suggest therefore that it is among environments including persons like these, that we should locate the general addressees or the Johannine community. Such an environment would be found in every Palestinian city with a mixed Jewish and Greek population and in every Greco-Roman Diaspora city.
2. All stories about this kind of surrounding in John are characterised by an invitation to believe in Jesus. In one way or another, all the ‘outsiders’ described are invited in a similar way.
3. The temple theme, which is present in connection with all the named groups of ‘outsiders’, is not employed in a reconsideration of the temple or the cultus in a different way than in the Samaritan encounter story. This means that the initial model explained above, the conjunction model, concerning the attitudes of the Johannine community towards the temple, remains unchallenged.

This explanation is mostly in accordance with the main conclusions in Dahl (1962) cited above, except from his understanding of the reference to the Ἑλληνες, and the ‘other sheep’ (for the reasons stated). I am also reluctant to accept the Samaritan narrative with its ‘spiritual worship’ as representing an activity that presupposes that the community had totally abandoned their ties to temple Judaism even at the time when the temple buildings were destroyed. Nevertheless, the christocentricity is the main characterisation of the Johannine attitude towards ‘outsiders’. When Dahl concludes that

the 'continuity between Israel and the church is understood in a peculiar way, but is not dissolved', it is a conclusion that remains probable also when transformed to a specific sociological terminology. This discussion resembles the discussion concerning the alleged anti-Judaism in John, (see e.g. Bieringer, Pollefeyt and Vandecasteele-Vanneuville 2001b). The discussion concerns particularly the relationship between inclusive and exclusive statements in John in relation to 'Jews'. One way to handle it is to say that inclusive or positive statements balance the exclusive and negative ones, e.g. that the declaration of God's boundless love (cf. 3:16–17) undermines the polemic in the Gospel against the 'Jews' (cf. 8:31–59). The alternative solution is of course that the polemic against the Jews undermines the declaration of God's boundless love (Reinhartz 2001a:227).

Nevertheless, from my sociological and historical point of view it is possible that these statements refer to a situation with both attitudes operative at the same time. It is also of utmost interest that there *are* groups and 'others' that the Johannine community treat in a low-tension manner. The Gospel presents a community with low tension to some 'outsiders' and high tension to others. Below, I will take a closer look at the evidence from Philo and Qumran to see if we can paint a picture of tension along similar lines in these groups of texts, too.

CHAPTER EIGHT

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PHILO AND QUMRAN

8.1 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN PHILO'S WRITINGS

8.1.1 *External Relationships Generally*

There are several statements in the writings of Philo that may be used to describe his social attitudes towards 'others' and that may demonstrate similar attitudes among other Alexandrian Jews. Throughout the Philonic corpus, we find statements concerning opponents to his own beliefs and practices as well as other philosophers and allegorists from ethnic groups of another faith. Only some of these instances will be evaluated in detail below, but the examples presented suffice to demonstrate the essentials of Philo's social relationships. I shall argue that Philo's descriptions are valuable in an evaluation of his social tension in comparison with the situation of the Johannine community. As a person described as being both 'Jew' and 'Alexandrian', he demonstrates the dilemma of any minority group.¹

Since it is difficult to speak of a 'Philo community' in the same way as we speak of a 'Johannine community' or a 'Qumran community' (see chapter 3), it is also difficult to speak specifically about 'outsiders' in Philo. An 'outsider', is a person that according to my definitions of a 'group', implies a higher degree of organisational level than what we find in the case of Philo, as I shall argue. Nevertheless, it is possible to discern some aspects of his external relationship. This issue of 'social relationships' in Philo has indeed been treated from different angles by many scholars. It is a part of the discussion referred to above about Philo as an 'Alexandrian'

¹ This dilemma is in the sociology of religion and the sociology of 'sects' explained in terms of two contradictory, yet complementary tendencies, i.e. compromise and rejection of the 'world', see O'Dea (1966:66); Troeltsch (1981). Every community must develop means by which it can preserve and protect itself, see P. Berger (1954:470), as well as the use of this insight in an interpretation of the Matthean community by Overman (1990:1 et al.).

and/or a 'Jew', but the problem may also be discussed under headings like 'rigorism',² 'self-definition',³ 'universalism and particularism',⁴ 'Greek or Jewish education',⁵ or through a study of words like 'Jew' and 'Gentile'.⁶ For the sociological comparison with the Gospel of John, my focus is on statements concerning non-Jewish groups and eventually non-observing Jews as well as Philo's opinion on Israel's role among the nations.

Philo often discusses the opinions of other persons in a respectful manner, whether they were other Jews (e.g. his fellow allegorists), Greek philosophers and poets, or Egyptian allegorists. Although their opinions are mostly dismissed, they are refuted with *reasoned* arguments.⁷ Of course, the references to these named 'others' do not tell us all about how he actually met with those who represented them, but they do present a man relatively *open* for the opinions and ideas of others—much in the manner of Socrates in a Platonic dialogue. He is a man who, to a certain degree, brings forth the opinions that he accepts as well as those he rejects. In addition, there are various passages in which he states his opinions on adjacent topics such as philanthropy and friendship.⁸

² Williamson (1970:252ff) uses this notion, which is after all, an intra-mural discussion among Alexandrian Jews, cf. also Seland (1995b). Internal relationships and rules for excommunication are more interesting in connection with the Qumran community where 1QS and other manuscripts give us direct information in this matter (cf. below).

³ See e.g. Goldstein (1981); Honigman (1993); Sterling (1995b). Sterling (1995b:12–15) operates with two factors in the 'self-definition' of Jews in Alexandria at the time, i.e. the understanding of God and observance of the Law.

⁴ See the references and discussion in chapter 5, in the discussion below and also in Borgen (1992b:135).

⁵ Arnaldez asks, for instance: 'La formation de Philon. Est-il grec ou juif?' (Arnaldez 1961). See also Heinemann (1962) 'Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung. Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze'.

⁶ This latter theme has been studied by Umemoto (1994). See also Sterling (1995a).

⁷ In Post. 39 for instance, Philo refers to his own opinions and those of his friends, ἀλλὰ παρ' ἑμοίγε καὶ φίλοις τοῖς ἑμοῖς κτλ. In Ebr. 1, he sums up the previous treatise referring to what other philosophers have said concerning this matter: τὰ μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσόφοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης κτλ. (before introducing the wisdom of the 'great lawgiver', i.e. Moses). See similar references to other opinions and what he thinks others would say about his own opinions in Gig. 15; Migr. 16; Plant. 18; Deus 21, 141.

⁸ On φιλανθρωπία, see particularly Virt. 51–74, the section that is called Περὶ φιλανθρωπίας. Sterling (1997) has focused on Philo's attitude to 'friendship' (φιλία), a notion with categories common in Stoicism and Middle Platonism (1997:206). See

His concerns and empathy for his fellow Jews in Roman Palestine as well as in Egypt are properly demonstrated in the political treatises *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*.⁹ However, we find remarks about and references to many named non-Jewish groups, peoples, nations¹⁰ and places—generally and specific individuals in almost every extant of his writing. He not only mentions particular persons and quotes and refers to the sayings of Greek poets and philosophers, he also states his understanding of these citations both symbolically and literally.¹¹ We find names of nations such as Egypt and Canaan, Greece and Macedonia, Euphrates, Syria, Persia and Palestine, and comments on Indians, Persians, Parthians, Chaldaeans, Romans, Arabs, and several others.¹² Often when he mentions these nations or groups of people, he includes comments on both their places and modes of worship in such a way that they resemble some of the negative comments on ‘outsiders’ in the Gospel of John. He is particularly observant when it comes to the practices of the Egyptians and others whom he says worship many gods.¹³ Many of these comments often take a particular passage of the scriptures as their point of departure, and do not appear to reflect historical realities of Jewish Alexandria. Nevertheless, when Philo abandons the subject of the biblical passage, his comments frequently expose what looks to be important socio-historical information.

also this issue in Winston’s analysis (1984:391–400) of Philo’s ethical theory, see Umemoto (1994:44ff); Borgen (1996c). Obviously, Jewish dietary laws made it difficult for Jews to share table fellowship with Gentiles who regarded this behaviour to be misanthropic and anti-social. Philo has to balance the universal claims of philanthropy and universalism with a very specific commitment to Judaism (Mendelson 1988:108–113).

⁹ See, for instance, the vivid example in *Flacc.* 96 where Philo describes with disgust how Jewish women were forced to eat pork during the pogrom.

¹⁰ ‘Nation’ is understood in a pre-modern and non-romantic sense.

¹¹ The examples are innumerable and he is described as an eclectic, see Arnaldez (1961:79ff).

¹² These names are used both symbolically and literally, taken from the biblical text and imported for other reasons. Some examples suffice to demonstrate this point: Egypt (*Leg.* 2:59), Canaan (*Abr.* 107), Greece and Macedonia (*Deus* 173), Euphrates (*Leg.* 1:85), Syria (*Congr.* 41); Indians (*Somn.* 2:56), Persians and Parthians (*Deus* 174), Chaldaeans (*Migr.* 178), Romans (*Flacc.* 40) and Arabs (*Mos.* 1:47).

¹³ See *Ebr.* 110 τὸ γὰρ πολὺθεὸν ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀφρόνων ψυχαῖς ἀθεότητα <κατασκευάζει> (‘For polytheism creates atheism in the souls of the foolish’). Sometimes Philo also speaks of ‘gods’ in plural. In the Latin translation of *Prov.* 2:64, we find ‘*dei*’, but this refers certainly to the stars (Hadas-Lebel 1973:293).

As with his relationship to the temple of Jerusalem, scholars vary in their evaluation of Philo's description of his social relationships to 'others'. Umemoto (1994) analyses the stated attitudes towards Gentiles and the human race generally in Philo and points first to the fact that Philo does not operate with the traditional (Septuagint) division of τὰ ἔθνη (peoples) and λαός (the Jewish people) but instead employs the term τὸ γένος ἀνθρώπων, 'the human kind', a term that includes the Jews. All other nations may be described by using the expression 'Greeks and Barbarians' ('Ἕλληνες καὶ βάρβαροι, see Cher. 91; Spec. 2:165). Although Umemoto notes the particular role of the Jewish people for the rest of the humankind, the analysis nevertheless stresses the universal aspect (1994:51):

Seine Aufgabe besteht darin, der Pflicht nachzukommen, die eigentlich dem gesamten Menschengeschlecht auferlegt ist, aber von ihm vernachlässigt wird, nämlich Gott zu dienen. Das 'wahre Israel' ist somit für Philon nichts anderes als die Schar der 'wahren' Menschen, die nach diesem Ziel strebend leben und diese Pflicht auf sich nehmen.

This view has rightly been criticised for being too universal (Fronrobert 1995).

In an evaluation with a similar perspective to mine, Mendelson (1988:115ff) concludes that Philo's attitude towards pagan religion was condescending and dismissive (1988:130) and he speaks of an underlying contempt for the customs of other people (1988:138). Mendelson (1988:128ff) evaluates expressions demonstrating a feeling among Alexandrian Jews of supremacy and sense of uniqueness, particularly when it comes to sacrifices (1988:134) but also in connection with Philonic features such as banquets, mourning, female chastity, the role of the lawgiver, myths and festivals.¹⁴ In fact, he (Mendelson 1988:138) goes far in an evaluation of Philo's attitude as being what New Testament and particularly Johannine scholars have named 'sectarian':

¹⁴ Philo compares the 'Greek' banquet with the banquet in the group of Therapeutae as evident in Contempl. 58ff. He compares female chastity of Greek priestesses who remained chaste under compulsion with the chastity of the women among the Therapeutae (Contempl. 68). He compares Abraham's mourning with the mourning of the neighbours (Abr. 260). He compares Moses as lawgiver with other lawgivers (Mos. 2:12), he compares the Jewish myths with pagan myths (Conf. 6; Det. 125; Opif. 157; Gig. 58–60) and he contrasts Jewish and pagan festivals (Cher. 91ff, see Mendelson 1988:134–137). In all these cases, Philo demonstrates Jewish distinctiveness, according to Mendelson.

In the end, however, Philo perceives himself to be in an alien environment. He retreats from it into his own community—an act which further confirms the pagan's view that the Jews are misanthropic. A vicious circle thus is established.

However, two sorts of observation contradict Mendelson's conclusions. First, there are other statements in Philo that certainly point in another and more universal direction that have to be balanced against the more exclusive ones (cf. the above views of Umemoto). Second, I shall argue that the idea of Jews being the priesthood for the rest of the world explain how Philo *at the end* looked upon the relationship better than any other statements since it is a metaphor that is on a general basis easily understood today too (see chapter 5 and below).

At any rate, one cannot discuss this topic in Philo without analysing what in fact made him a part of a particular Jewish community. In my study of social relationships in Philo, I shall therefore follow a different route. It is not my intention to try to develop a similar complete picture of every aspect of Philo's meaning of words such as Gentiles—as Umemoto does. Rather, I shall focus on what Philo writes about named groups such as Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans and develop a characterisation of his attitudes and social tensions on that basis. My primary aim is, finally, to compare his attitude with the attitudes found in the Gospel of John as described above.

8.1.2 *Named Groups and Their Worship*

8.1.2.1 *Egyptians*

Considering the prominent role of Moses in the Old Testament/Tanak and in Philo's writings, the mentioning of Egypt in different connections is not surprising (see Meeks 1967). His negative attitudes towards Egyptians are, however, too derogatory to be a result of biblical reading and ancestral traditions alone.¹⁵

¹⁵ There are several Biblical passages that make the negative characterisations of Egyptians understandable. The Passover was a celebration of the liberation from an Egyptian pharaoh. Ezra 9:1 speaks of the abominations of other nations, including Egyptians. Josephus assumes that the agitator behind the riot on the Mount of Olives at Jerusalem in 58 CE was an Egyptian (Antiq. 20:169–172; Bell. 2:261–263, and cf. Acts 21:37–39 on Paul). Philo's characterisation is much worse; it is very precise and indicates personal experience. See also Pelletier (1962:170–171), Mendelson (1988:116–122); Collins (2000); and particularly Niehoff (2002). Mendelson

Philo's comments on Egypt combine several features. He comments on the ancient Egyptian king (Pharaoh), the land itself and different geographical locations like the Nile, and he understands the mentioning of Egypt in the holy scriptures both in a literal and a symbolic way.¹⁶ Egyptian virtues and passions are ascribed to the 'body' and thus considered negative in a categorical way.¹⁷ His disapproving judgement of Egyptians is particularly marked by the incidents before and during the pogrom that took place after Gaius became emperor in 37 CE, and Philo even calls them slanderous or malignant.¹⁸ The Egyptians were definitely at the bottom of the social ladder in Alexandria and the Jews thought perhaps they could dismiss them with impunity, an attitude that may have coloured the atmosphere between them (Mendelson 1988:121).

It is in his judgement of Egyptian animal worship that Philo is most negative and where he presents comments that are clearly different from some of his descriptions of the Gentile Greek worship (see Spec. 3:22–23). Criticism of people who worship 'the created instead of the creator', as well as harsh criticism of *polytheism* are typical for his attitude against these Egyptians.¹⁹ The Egyptians' worship of wild beasts is particularly targeted for such abuses. In Decal.

(1988:118–119) finds that Philo added anti-Egyptian elements that were not justified by the text and uses Philo's reference to Hagar as one example (Abr. 251, cf. Gen 16:1).

¹⁶ A neutral or geographical way of reference is found in Abr. 92 where Philo explains why Abraham went to Egypt. The Egyptian king is in Leg. 3:8 read as a symbol for 'vice'. In Migr. 151, the land of Egypt is said to symbolise the 'body'. Somn. 2:109 describes the Nile as the 'Egyptian river of passion'.

¹⁷ In addition to the mentioned passages, see Congr. 20–21; Conf. 70; Agr. 88–89; Sacr. 51, 130; Ebr. 95. In Leg. 2:103; Migr. 202; Congr. 83–85, for instance, the 'Egyptians' is read symbolically as 'passions'. Egypt 'is' also pleasure (e.g. Fug. 147–148; QG 4:177), 'atheism' (e.g. Post. 2; Fug. 180), they are jealous (Flacc. 29) and arrogant by nature (Agr. 62). Mendelson (1988:117) mentions several of these passages and points to the interesting fact that when Philo also speaks of their inhumanity and impiety (QE 1:10) and refers to their inhospitality and licentiousness (Abr. 107): 'Philo has simply turned the tables' since these allegations were also made against the Jews. Mendelson uses these observations in a context of arguments not unlike mine, but with another purpose.

¹⁸ Evident in Flacc. 17, 29 (βάσκανον γὰρ φύσει τὸ Αἰγυπτιακόν, Flacc. 29).

¹⁹ Passages with criticism of the worship of the created are for example Migr. 178; Congr. 49; Virt. 212ff (about the Chaldaeans), and on polytheism, see Opif. 170–172; Fug. 8, 114; Mut. 205; Virt. 221; QG 1:36 and see above. A related issue, anthropomorphism of God is, on the other hand, seen as excusable on pedagogical grounds (Conf. 134–135, see Mendelson 1988:7). Philo also seems to argue that polytheism leads to atheism, see Ebr. 110 (Mendelson 1988:37–38).

76ff, he criticises them for their worship of animals, evidently described in opposition to the worship of the true living God. Joshua is presented as a man who tried to make a god of Typhus, the golden calf, a god especially honoured among the Egyptians (Ebr. 95, see also Post. 158; Mos. 2:161–162; Sacr. 130). All their gods of bulls, rams, and goats are all fictitious and false, he declares (Post. 165). He argues against the worship of animals in his habitual reasoned way; the Egyptians must see that these animals are born, are susceptible to disease and that they perish, etc.—observations that should have lead them to the conclusion that these gods are made by humans (Contempl. 8–9). In Mos. 2:193ff, another aspect of the Egyptian worship is criticised, namely the concept that there is a competition between heaven and earth. Philo explains this concept rationally with a plain geographic understanding saying that it is an effect of the Nile, since the blessings of the water in Egypt come from below, i.e. from the river, and not from the heavenly rain as in most other countries (Mos. 2:194–195). Therefore, an opposition between heaven and earth lies naturally at hand for them, he surmises. Consequently, he declares that the Egyptian ‘body’ abominates virtues, and virtues are the *ideal* sacrifices (Fug. 18 quoting Exod 8:26).²⁰

When it comes to the admitting of new participants of the Jewish community in Alexandria, Philo argues that Egyptians who wanted to become proselytes may do so (Virt. 106–108).²¹ The use of πολιτεία in this passage may indicate that Philo is actually referring to the historical situation in Alexandria and that his opinions apply to Deut 23:7, which Philo is paraphrasing (see Borgen 1996c:180). These Egyptians are, however, men who have turned *away* from the worship

²⁰ ‘But Moses said, ‘It would not be right to do so; for the sacrifices that we offer to the LORD our God are offensive to the Egyptians. If we offer in the sight of the Egyptians sacrifices that are offensive to them, will they not stone us?’ (Exod 8:26).

²¹ καὶν εἴ τις ἐθελήσειαν αὐτῶν μεταλλάξασθαι πρὸς τὴν Ἰουδαίων πολιτείαν, οὐχ ὡς ἐχθρῶν παίδας ἀσυμβάτως σκορακιστέον. ‘And if any of them should wish to pass over into the Jewish community, they must not be spurned with an unconditional refusal as children of enemies’ (Virt. 108). Mendelson (1988:119, n. 19) mentions that not every reference by Philo to the Egyptians is negative, since Philo in Spec. 1:2 speaks favourably of the Egyptian race saying it was ‘pre-eminent for its populousness, its antiquity and its attachment to philosophy’. In the actual paragraph, however, Philo defends the idea of circumcision and uses the Egyptian example as an argument against the accusation of Jewish particularism in this matter (see Daniel 1975:13–14).

of animals and the passage therefore demonstrates his attitude towards proselytes rather than nuancing his attitudes towards Egyptians and Egyptian worship. Likewise, Abraham is described as a believer of Chaldaean astrology (Virt. 211–220)²² *before* he converted to the faith in God. Thus Abraham, who is declared by Philo to be the most ancient member of the Jewish nation (Virt. 211), becomes κανών, ‘an example’ (model, measure, or standard) for all strangers or proselytes: οὗτος ἅπασιν ἐπηλύταις εὐγενείας ἐστὶ κανών (‘he is the standard of nobility for all proselytes’, Virt. 219).²³

Admittedly, many references to Egypt and Egyptians are derived from passages in which Philo is clearly indebted to the scriptural reading, but the use of these notions and the negative attitude towards the Egyptian worship of animals, are quite pejorative and connected to the threat of polytheism. It is difficult to see how Alexandrian Jews such as Philo could have judged and treated the Egyptians of these traditions in a friendly manner, particularly seen against his personal experience during the pogrom of 37–38 CE.

8.1.2.2 *Other Nations*

On the other hand, individuals and groups of other nations may be described in a more favourable way; again it is an evaluation of their worship that seems to be the main guiding principle for Philo himself, although foreign laws compared to the Law of Moses are often discussed, too.

In some passages, the picture given of Greeks may stand in direct contrast to the description of Egyptians and eradicate the impression of a person in very high tension with his surrounding. Jews requested full citizenship in Alexandria including participation in the cultural institutions. When this was denied, it created a sore point and a strained situation (Borgen 1984a:253), but their eagerness to participate in the Hellenistic culture speaks for itself. Many Jews in Alexandria were almost totally hellenised, both in language, education and culture generally (Borgen 1984a:254ff; 1984b:113). Philo

²² Philo describes Abraham as one who looks upon the stars and the whole heaven and universe as gods, see especially Virt. 212; Decal. 64. See also above on the connection between stars and gods.

²³ ἐπηλύτης can also mean ‘incomer, foreigner’ and ‘stranger’ (Liddell, Scott, Jones et al. 1940:620).

may also refer to known Greeks in a very positive terms; he shows familiarity with other philosophical schools apart from Stoicism, Platonism and Pythagoreanism and with Greek literature in general (Borgen 1984a:256). He defends Abraham when he wanted to sacrifice Isaac, by referring to Greeks, Indians, and examples of such sacrifices in their writings (Abr. 167ff). Although he is occupied with showing the differences between the Jewish event and similar events in other nations (Abr. 184; Spec. 1:312), the purpose of the arguments is clearly apologetic. Mendelson (1988:132–133) uses this example, on the contrary, as an argument in favour of Philo's sense of uniqueness, and of how Philo dissociates with the Barbarians. However, the distinctiveness of the Jewish example of child-sacrifice as Philo explains it makes the event understandable and thus acceptable for his readers. The fact that there are similar events in the writings and practice of other nations at the same time reduces the Jewish distinctiveness. The other Philonic features that Mendelson finds as examples of Jewish distinctiveness over against other nations function, in a similar way, not to demonstrate that Jews are the only virtuous persons in antiquity, but to demonstrate that the Jewish customs are not inferior to high-standard virtues. In both cases, contrary to Mendelson's opinion, I think Philo demonstrates a willingness to accommodate, while at the same he is not denying the fact that the event is recounted in the holy writings.

Other observations point in the same direction. The particular and admirable role of Moses in relation to other lawgivers in any country, among Greeks or 'Barbarians', is described in Mos. 2:12ff. Moses' laws were naturally better than any other laws since they were stamped by the seal of *nature* herself (cf. Philo's statement in Mos. 2:14: καθάπερ σφραγῖσι φύσεως αὐτῆς σεσημασμένα). This is the reason they have never been changed, a fact that also demonstrates the prominent position of these laws. Further, in Spec. 3:22–23 the Mosaic prescription that forbids marriage between brother and sister is compared to similar paragraphs in Solon's law of Athens, the law in Sparta (Lacedaemonia) and stands in contrast to Egyptian law where marriage was permitted between brother and sister of the same mother and father, he argues. However, Greek laws and to some extent laws of other peoples are highly regarded as reminiscences of the Mosaic Law and Philo's favourable attitude towards Greek culture is evident when he states that what the Greeks call 'heroes' Moses calls 'angels' (Plant. 14).

Characteristics of Romans are unsurprisingly equivocal. The direct references to Romans are for the most part found in the historical treatises *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*. Particularly interesting is Philo's critique of emperor Gaius in *Legatio ad Gaium* when he wanted to be honoured as god, seen in his dreadful wish to erect statues of himself in the temple of Jerusalem. The same negative attitude towards Roman emperor worship is also found in connection with the pogrom in Alexandria and the erection of statues of Gaius in the Alexandrian synagogues (*Legat.* 132ff; *Flacc.* 41ff).²⁴ Nevertheless, Philo argues that the desecration of the synagogue meant that they no longer would be able to pay homage to the Roman emperor (*Flacc.* 48ff) and in that way he indirectly demonstrates his and his fellow Jews' favourable attitudes towards earlier emperors.

Other nations also show a favourable behaviour. What Philo admires is their virtue (ἀρετή). In fact, there are virtuous men in every country, he argues. He finds them especially in Greece, in the land of Barbarians (the Magi of Persia). The gymnosophists of India are mentioned in a honourable way.²⁵ In *Virt.* 34 we find, however, a negative attitude towards Arabs, but only for one particular reason, their enmity to the Jews, an enmity that comes from the fact that the Hebrews honour and worship the highest and mightiest cause (αἰτίον), the creator and father of the universe, he argues. The main point is not whether Philo actually believed that all 'Arabs' behaved like this. The main point from my perspective is the reason for his attitudes. Every virtue and deed, cultus and worship, belief and practice of other nations is always measured against the Jewish faith in the one God.

In *Cher.* 91ff, Philo criticises the way the temple festivals of Barbarians and Greeks (ἔθνη βαρβαρικά . . . καὶ ἑλληνικά) are per-

²⁴ In the treatise *In Flaccum*, the violation of the meeting places or synagogues precedes the pogrom, while the pogrom described in *Legatio ad Gaium* is followed by an attack upon the synagogues. But this fact should not make us doubt the historical validity of Philo's report. The main point is here to demonstrate the reactions of Philo regardless of the historical validity. See also my discussion of this incidence and its importance for our understanding of Philo's view of the temple (chapter 5.2.2).

²⁵ See *Abr.* 182; *Prob.* 74, 93ff concerning the story of the gymnosophist Calanus, see *Somn.* 2:56. He also refers to the Essenes of Palestine and Syria in *Prob.* 73ff, arguing that they represent ideal virtues.

formed. In this case, he is not accusing them for not honouring the one God, but for the fact that virtue is ridiculed, a meaningless behaviour according to his standards. They wash their bodies in baths, but their passions are not washed away, he contends. He criticises them for thinking that God's eye sees the external objects alone. The eye of the living God (ὁ τοῦ ὄντος ὀφθαλμός, Cher. 97) is itself the archetypal light that sends rays of light only perceivable to the *intellect*. It is difficult to know for sure on the basis of these passages if Philo implicitly admits that there is another route to God. Connected with this question is the possibility of recognising God through philosophy. He comments on this issue in Spec. 2:165, arguing that it is the highest father of both humans and gods that all these men in fact are trying to discover. Virt. 65 expresses the same idea as an example of the humanity (φιλανθρωπία) of the Jews, indicating perhaps that it is possible to gain an understanding of God through philosophy, without the Jewish Law.²⁶

Thus, this philosophical understanding and the Jewish insights may intersect. However, both these statements are uttered in connection with his statement that the Jewish nation has a special place among humans, contending that all humans are in one way dependent on the Jews (Spec. 2:164; Virt. 64). Likewise, when Philo in Spec. 3:15 compares laws and customs in several nations, he gives prominence to the Mosaic Law. In this way, he maintains allegiance to his ancestral faith, but his position is somewhat ambiguous, a fact that indicates a partly favourable attitude towards 'others' of this kind.

8.1.3 *The Universal Role of Israel*

The universal role of Israel as priesthood for the rest of the world, or for the whole world, is central for the understanding of the relationship between the Jews and the rest of humankind in Philo and therefore also turns out to be the core idea for the evaluation of social tension in Philo's community.²⁷ The notion of priesthood and

²⁶ 'For what the disciples of the most excellent philosophy gain from its teaching, the Jews gain from their customs and laws, that is to know the highest, the most ancient Cause of all things and reject the delusion of created gods' (Virt. 65). Sterling (1995b:13) mentions non-Jewish authors with similar statements (Plutarch and Numenius), see also Sterling (1993).

²⁷ Moses is the one who established the idea of priesthood according to Philo, see Mos. 1:149 and Mos. 2:186, cf. Spec. 2:163–164, 167; Sobr. 66 and Abr. 56–57

similar expressions may explain the combination of passages in Philo speaking of Israel's exclusiveness on the one side, and general universalism on the other. It indicates that despite the widespread ideal of holiness by separation from the Gentiles in postexilic Judaism (Collins 2000:12–13), this does not necessarily lead to a strong particularism. If the notions 'particularism' and 'universalism' are to be used at all, we should refer to *Israel's role as priesthood* for the whole word as the 'particularist' aspect of Philo's attitude, and Israel's role as priesthood for *the whole word* as the 'universalist' aspect of Philo's attitude. This is an idea that further strengthens the impression that Philo after all represents a relatively low-tension group, although it might also imply exclusiveness if the idea was connected to certain social privileges. This thesis corresponds to several other observations.

Philo wants to explain what he looks upon as peculiarities in his ancestral traditions. In Spec. 4:179, he compares the situation of the Jews to an *orphan* (cf. ἔθνος ὀρφανόν), since the nation has no allies by reason of their peculiar laws and customs according to Philo. It was known that the Jews did not want to mingle with other nations and Philo demonstrates a certain attitude of supremacy of the Jews in relation to other nations, as Mendelson (1988:128) argues, but it is of vital interest to determine this attitude further.

The attitude of supremacy is seen in various statements. Philo warned fellow Jews against fraternising with the multitude (οἱ πολλοί) and resorting to their temples or to joining in their libations and sacrifices (Spec. 1:316). He explains why: it is by reason of the nature of their customs (Mos. 1:278). In Mos. 1:324, he lets Moses state that all Jews are 'one race, the same fathers, one house, the same customs, community of laws, and other things innumerable, each of which strengthens the tie of kinship and harmony of goodwill.'²⁸ If one was able to make a fresh start, what would people then think of the Jewish nation, Philo asks in Mos. 2:44. Answering the question himself, he writes that they would abandon all their individual customs and come over to the honour of Israel only.

are both referring to Exod 19:6; see also QE 1:10. Cf. Borgen 1984a:235, n. 10, 269, 271 on the universal role of Moses and Israel, Seland (1995a); Scholer (1991:63–71) and my presentation in chapter 5. Mos. 2:186ff presents an eschatological background for the idea of Israel as priesthood (Borgen 1984b:151).

²⁸ §§ 319–33 refer to the incidence recounted in Num 32 concerning those tribes that wanted to settle down east of Jordan. Philo refers to a speech by Moses to these tribes (see Mos. 1:320) but the ideas relate to all Jews.

In Decal. 32, Philo declares that the Decalogue proceeded directly from God, the Father of All. One of the main advantages of this law is as stated above—that it has remained unchanged—while the laws of other nations and cities constantly shift (Mos. 2:17). Consequently, for Philo, the Mosaic Law has influenced the laws elsewhere (the whole inhabited world, Europe and Asia etc., Mos. 2:20–25) and not vice versa. However, this view clearly made it difficult at times for a man of his rational nature, since some of the Jewish laws were totally unknown to other nations—an observation that threatens to tear down his whole argument. In the discussion of Gen 9:3 in QG 2:58, he mentions, for example, a discussion concerning the often ridiculed prohibition of eating pork, almost totally unknown in other nations. He refers to an argument that this must be generally *allowed* since God declared that ‘as the green herb I have given you all things’, but Philo argues that this prescription applies to vegetables. The prohibition to eat pork only concerns the Jewish nation as a nation particularly elected for a divine purpose, he declares. The references to the rebukes of the prescription in his way of arguing indicate that this is an objection Philo had met in Alexandria. This is an explanation of a prohibition that is apt to reduce tension towards non-Jews rather than increasing it, since it is logically explained and implies a practice that is restricted to the Jews alone.

Israel is described as prosperous and as the most populous of nations (cf. *πολυανθρωπότατον ἔθνος*, Spec. 1:133), certainly indicating its blessing. In other passages, this same phrase is brought up in connection with other functions of the nations, e.g.: ‘the most populous of all nations everywhere’, and a nation which puts forth the most important of all professions, the ‘suppliant [worship/prayer] of Him who truly exists’ (*ἱκεσία τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος*, Virt. 64). The reason for God to choose this nation was, according to Philo in Spec. 4:181, the righteousness and virtue that the founders of the nation had demonstrated. Seen isolated, such statements may easily lead to the conclusion that Philo belongs to a tradition that must expect trouble and high tension in a Greco-Roman context such as the city of Alexandria.

There is, however, a basic universalism behind all Philo’s passages concerning the relationship between God and the world, a universalism that also reduces the impression of social tensions. This is reflected in the idea of Israel as a universal priesthood. The

universalism of Philo comes to expression in several ways in addition to the idea that Israel serves the function of being a priesthood for the whole world:

1. The whole world belongs to God, see Mos. 1:201 which defines the relationship as a slave-master relationship.²⁹
2. Everything is ‘one’ according to Spec. 1:208: ἥτοι ὡς ἐν τὰ πάντα ἢ ὅτι ἐξ ἑνός τε καὶ εἰς ἓν (‘either that all things are one or that they come from and return to one’).
3. This universalism is also expressed in the temple building which reflects all the four elements according to Mos. 2:88. In Mos. 2:189, Philo says that through the Mosaic Law, God wants to lead all men to happiness through the one race (γένος), the nation of Jews.
4. The one who loves God will also love every man (e.g. QG 3:42).

It is against this background we must see his statements concerning Israel or the Jews generally. He may look upon Israel as an orphan nation, a fact that indicates social tension perhaps referring to the politically tense situation of the Alexandrian Jews in the fourth decade CE—as also seen in the edict from Claudius (see chapter 3) but there is also a universalism that may balance the overall picture of his general attitude towards ‘others’.

8.1.4 Conclusion: mixed tension

For the overall purpose of this study, it is interesting to observe that Philo clearly defines the relationship between God and the Jewish nation as a relationship primarily between God and all humans. Philo’s stated philanthropy in fact includes all men—even the much-criticised Egyptians—although there is evidently a wide difference between his attitudes towards the Egyptians who worship animals and the Greeks with a philosophical understanding of God as the Final Cause. He contends that the Jewish law is superior to the law of other nations, and the Romans under Gaius are consequently crit-

²⁹ ‘But God has subject to Him not one portion of the universe, but the whole world and its parts, to minister as slaves to their master for every service that He wills’ (Mos. 1:201).

icised for their lack of understanding of the special role of the temple and the synagogues. Philo admires virtue wherever he finds it, and in some instances, it seems that it is the abuse of the Gentile festivals rather than the festivals themselves and the expressed polytheism that are criticised.

Certain passages like Spec. 2:165, may be used to demonstrate that Philo looks upon contemplative philosophy to be an adequate worship of the one God. But on the other hand, severe criticism of polytheism and of any worship of animals or any other parts of the creation is clearly stated. This semi-acceptance of a non-Jewish philosophical understanding of God and Philo's claim that there is only one single God, the Creator, his acceptance of a symbolic understanding of the Mosaic Law and his stress on the literal character and consequences of the Law, may seem contradictory to us. Philo also presents a two-sided picture of his relationship to 'others': he is inclusive towards some non-Jewish understandings of God and exclusive to others.

The 'priesthood model' that Philo presents as model for the situation of Israel in the world, turns out to be a model that well explains his and his fellow Jews' position in Alexandria, or at least how he himself wanted it to be. As there are particular rules for the priest within the Jewish nation, there are particular rules for the Jews among other people, for example the prohibition of eating pork. People belonging to other nations, perhaps even Egyptians, may become a member of this universal priesthood through proselytism. We must also bear in mind the conclusions of many Philo scholars today, that Philo cannot be taken to be an allegorising philosopher without any contact with Palestinian Judaism. On the contrary—he does support the temple, he reads the scriptures literally, and the allegorical understanding of the temple does not imply that he has abrogated any part of the Law according to his own view. His statements concerning social relationships and of what we today call 'others' describe, in fact, a similar relationship between literal and symbolic understanding of the Law. Although there is a universal outlook on the relationship to the Gentiles, this relationship is described as depending on Israel and her special relationship to God.

In a comparison with John and the universal role of Jesus, I have observed differences in relation to the universal role of the temple and the role of the Jews. John and Philo have particularly one aspect in common in this respect, i.e. while Philo points to the particular

role of Jews for the world, John points to the particular role of the Messiah, *Jesus* for the world. Despite this essential difference, there is a similar variation of tensions in their relationship to 'others'. Both Philo and John write about groups in a way that reflects low tension. Both have traumatic events behind them (pogrom, ejection/persecution) that govern their understanding and presentation. In some ways, therefore, Philo bears witness to a story parallel to that of the Gospel of John in a sociological perspective; there is a strong effort to be accepted on the one hand, and a subsequent disappointment when met with refutation on the other.

8.2 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN QUMRAN WRITINGS

8.2.1 *The Uniqueness of the Community*

I shall study aspects of presented social relationships to 'others' in the Qumran community by briefly analysing the use of some notions found in its writings concerning attitudes towards 'others' like Gentiles, other nations, proselytes and foreigners as well as attitudes reflected in internal designations and rules.³⁰

In many of the core manuscripts, however, notions for such groups of people are not employed, and social relationships in these writings must be studied in other ways and indirectly. Their social relationships to 'outsiders'—and we should rather speak of 'outsiders' than 'others' where Qumran writings are concerned—form a part of a discussion of these Dead Sea Scrolls aiming at a comparison with the results of the investigation from the Gospel of John and the writings of Philo. In this way, I also hope to gain a better view of the character of the Qumran community. As stated earlier, the Qumran community seems to be a society in high tension with its surroundings, and we may expect a similar degree of tension as with the Johannine community. However, my analysis will demonstrate an essential *difference* between the Johannine and the Qumran community when it comes to tension.

Scholars have discussed the uniqueness of the Qumran community concerning organisational patterns and patterns of protest. Hengel

³⁰ The scholarly Qumran discussions have not focused much on this subject lately, perhaps due to the questions raised with the release of new 4Q fragments, but the issue is not forgotten, see Deines (1994).

(1974a) argues that, in accordance with the dualistic picture of history, the Teacher in the Dead Sea Scrolls and his followers advocated an abrupt separation from all the 'sons of wickedness' (1974a:228). They also separated from all the opponents of the movement among their own people, and still more all non-Jews. In the face of tendencies towards Hellenistic influence, the Essenes 'held the view that only rigorous separation from everything godless could meet the demands of the imminent time of salvation' (1974a:228). Hengel also claims that 'its members were aware that they had chosen a form of community life that was not in the Old Testament' (1974a:244–245).³¹

Nevertheless, some observations indicate that there were similar social phenomena in the time of the Qumran community (about 170 BCE–70 CE). Schmidt (1994) argues that there are biblical models for the Yahad in the *prophetic* examples of protest.³² Community models may also be found outside Judaism. Weinfeld (1986) argues that there were some Hellenistic-Roman parallels to the central organisational issues of the Qumran group. This again only demonstrates its uniqueness among Jewish groups at that time. Even if they did not have exact biblical organisational models, they might have been influenced by Hellenistic patterns for guilds and associations, he argues and finds resemblance at various points, both in terminology and in practice. Weinfeld (1986:21–23) also includes an evaluation of their recruitment politics and finds the following five elements in the process of accepting new members into the Qumran community:

1. The examination: 1QS 6:14,
2. the registration in the Yahad: 1QS 5:23,
3. the decision by lot: 1QS 6:16,
4. the oath: 1QS 5:18, and
5. submitting private property: 1QS 6:18ff.

³¹ See my above references to the debate concerning the model of the community (Schmidt 1994; Lemche 1998).

³² See also my chapter 5. In the prophetic tradition, there were two main models that explain their reactions: 1. the exile model of Ezekiel and 2. the exodus model of Isaiah (Schmidt 1994:134ff). Lemche (1996; 1998:192–193) also argues in favour of biblical models saying that it is obvious that some of the Qumran writings followed the pattern laid out in the biblical literature.

Weinfeld argues that these patterns were common within religious associations of Ptolemaic Egypt; those of the Hellenistic and Roman worlds were likewise based on similar ordinances (1986:24–26). Similar patterns are also found in Persia. Weinfeld (1986:71) criticises Schiffman (1983) for regarding these traits as unique for the Qumran community. Klinghardt (1994:252) also argues that in regard to genre and contents, the closest parallels to the *Serek* are statutes of Hellenistic associations and that the community can be seen as a ‘synagogue community’. Anyway, there are clearly other properties that *were* special for the Qumran Community. Stegemann (1992b:108ff) points to four significant peculiarities of the Qumran Essenes at the time, i.e. their common meals, their purificatory ritual bath, their hierarchy and their particular rules concerning admission of new members.

We see that there are reasons to believe that the community was unique in some ways, although similarities can be found, both in organisational pattern and nature of protest. The starting point for my textual analysis is the main descriptions in 1QS of the members of the *Yahad* and those to which they opposed or the ‘outsiders’, and to detect possible relations between these categories (self-description and social relationships).³³

8.2.2 *Self-Description and Internal Rules in the Serek*

1QS uses several terms that describe its originator(s). The most important self-designation is naturally *Yahad*, יחד (e.g. 1QS 5:1–2), which might be translated as ‘community’, but with other possible translations, such as ‘as union’ (see chapter 3). *Yahad* seems to designate the whole community and not just parts of it, and may be placed in combinations such as e.g. ‘men of the community’, אנשי היחד (1QS 5:1) and ‘community of God’, יחד אל (1QS 1:12). Further, the text uses designations relating to members such as ‘the many’, הרבים, ‘men of God’s lot’, אנשי נורל אל, and ‘sons of the eternal society’, בני סוד עולמים. It even likens these men to ‘sons of heaven’, בני שמים, in the phrase ‘He unites their assembly to the sons of heavens’.³⁴

³³ The relationship in CD is described by P. Davies (1996:164) who finds that the community behind the CD was ‘sectarian’ in a sociological sense.

³⁴ הרבים (1QS 6:7, 8, 9); אנשי נורל אל ‘men of God’s lot’ (1QS 2:2–3); and also בני סוד עולמים ‘sons of the eternal society’ (1QS 2:25); בני שמים ‘sons of heaven’ (1QS 11:8). Weinfeld (1986:14) argues that הרבים is identical with the יחד in its meaning. In some manuscripts, other designations are in use: ‘congregation’, עדת (1QSa 1:1), see Schürer (1979:275); Weinfeld (1986:13ff); Cross (1995:161).

ברית is a key word for them in 1QS and also elsewhere. The expression 'covenant before God', ברית לפני אל (1QS 1:16), for instance, the covenant is not looked upon as a covenant between individuals, but as a collective covenant valid for all.³⁵ Their exclusiveness is indicated when they declare that they look upon themselves as 'selected ones of humankind', cf. בחירי אדם (1QS 11:17).³⁶

Designations like these are of course informative, and they indicate a community with a high degree of self-consciousness. In a sociological perspective, the auto-designations connected to divine power are designations with a high order of social legitimating. Seen isolated, however, these designations are not particularly informative concerning the social character of the group as long as we cannot relate them to their internal rules and sanctions, as well as to external relationships.

The rules and sanctions described as authoritative for this group mostly demonstrate a harsh attitude. The 'levites' are to curse 'all the men of the lot of Belial', כול אנשי נורל בלעל (1QS 2:4–5), in accordance with the curses in Deut 27:14ff. The rules are, however, internal rules; those who break the rules are cursed, for instance by urging 'may he be cut off from the midst of all the sons of light', נכרת מחוך כול בני אור (1QS 2:16)—in a context of curses running from 1QS 2:11–17. K. Weber (1994) argues that these curses have an obvious eschatological character and that נכרת should be understood in the same manner, and therefore does not imply total excommunication from the community. This is also in accordance with similar passages in 1QS that refer to punishments, see e.g. 1QS 6:26; 7 (punished) and 1QS 6:25; 7:3, 5, 18; 8:24 (excluded and expelled). Declination or expulsion from the group is also described in 1QS 2:25–3:6. A person unwilling to follow the rules and the program of the community is described as walking 'in the stubbornness of his heart' בשרירות לבו (1QS 5:4). The internal organisation is described in 1QS 6:1ff, for instance, in the prescription saying that if ten men are gathered there should always be a priest among them (1QS

³⁵ Cf. also 'the sons of his covenant' 1QM 17:8. The covenant is called 'new' חדש ('new covenant in the land of Damascus') in CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:33b; 20:12; cf. 1QpHab 2:3, see Cross (1995:160).

³⁶ The expression may also refer to Israel more generally, but see the expression 'the proper heirs to the covenant' (CD 8:17). Other designations might be more informative: They looked upon themselves as the שארית 'remnant' (see CD 1:4; 1QH 14:8; 1QM 13:8).

6:3–4a). 1QS 6–9 concern many internal relationships and rules, punishments for e.g. lying (1QS 6:24ff) and blasphemy (1QS 7:1), exclusion and punishment for having spoken angrily to a priest (1QS 7:3). The one who betrays the community ‘shall never return to the community council’, *לֹא יָשׁוּב אֶל עֲצַת הַיָּהוּד* (1QS 7:24–26) and again later: ‘(for all) those who deviate from the path’, *עַל כֹּל סוֹרְרֵי דֶרֶךְ* (1QS 10:20–21), there will be no mercy from God.³⁷

The process of exclusion from the movement or from the inner circle is also seen from 1QS 7:3 and 8:21b–23a, the latter pointing to the fact that ‘anyone of them who breaks a word of the law of Moses impertinently or through carelessness will be banished from the Community council and shall not return again.’ As indicated above, however, the exclusion passages do not always refer to a total excommunication from the community, only exclusion from parts of it. The offenders may return, at least to a certain degree (e.g. 1QS 8:25–26). This means that the group not only was eager to recruit new members, its members may also have tried to keep those who broke the rules within the community.

As a designation for members in highly negative notions is ‘spirit of deceit’, *רוּחַ עוֹלָה* (1QS 4:9), consisting of all kind of regrettable acts and physical defects (1QS 4:9–11) and they are accordingly named ‘men of deceit’, cf. *אֲנָשֵׁי הַרְמִיָּה* (1QS 9:8). In the rules for the ‘Inspector’, *מִשְׁכִּיל*, it says that he is to have *שְׂנֵאתָ עוֹלָם עִם אֲנָשֵׁי שְׁחָה* ‘everlasting hatred for the men of the pit’ (1QS 9:21b–22a). The expression *אֲנָשֵׁי שְׁחָה* ‘men of the pit’, is repeated (1QS 9:22; 10:19), and the text may use negatively loaded words like ‘unjust men’, cf. *אֲנָשֵׁי עוֹלָה* (1QS 10:20) to describe those who break the rules.

All these designations mentioned above are probably for internal use, but demonstrate high demands and standards. A complete list of all rules and sanctions is not necessary for my purpose. Both the self-designations and internal relationships point towards a group with strict rules and sanctions. They also indicate that this is a text whose

³⁷ See also 1QS 7:24ff about expulsion from the council: {...} However, anyone who has been in the Community council {...} for ten full years. {...} and whose spirit reverts to betray the Community and go away from the presence of the Many in order to walk in the stubbornness of his heart, will never return to the Community council.’ 1QS 10:20–21: ‘I shall not sustain angry resentment for those who convert from iniquity, but shall have no mercy for all those who deviate from the path.’

concrete regulations existed in and for a community and that often grew out of the life of the community as ad hoc rules. To gain a clearer picture of the community we shall also have to further study their external relationships.

8.2.3 *External Relationships in 1QS*

Even more illustrating than these designations for internal use are passages that deal with newcomers. We find several descriptions of the movements from the outside to the inside. The expression '(those who) freely volunteer', cf. *המתנדבים* or *הנדבים* is used quite often (see 1QS 1:7, 11; 5:1, 6, 8, 10, 21, 22; 6:13) and the volunteered action is in this way redundantly expressed and stressed. The possibility to enter the community for new members is demonstrated otherwise in expressions like 'all those who enter into the rule of community', *כול הבאים בסרך היחד* (1QS 1:16) and in 'when someone enters the covenant', *כיא יבוא בברית* (1QS 5:20) and then the testing 'year after year' (1QS 5:24) and decision by lot is prescribed. The result is announced as 'he shall be included or excluded', *יקרב או ירחק* (1QS 6:16), and then the newcomer is tested for two years. It is thus indicated in these passages that this community did recruit new members—an observation that in itself indicates a group that was *interacting* with their socio-cultural milieu in some way or were not totally exclusive.

In the designations expressing a dualism, the main term is the metaphor 'light/darkness', and a similar expression is also found in the entire comparative material in this investigation (John, Philo, and Qumran) and thus suitable for comparison, not only to the Gospel of John but also to several New Testaments writings, as scholars often have observed.³⁸ Almost at the very start of the manuscript (1QS 1:9–10) the dualistic terms 'sons of light and sons of darkness' *בני אור* and also *בני חושך*, are presented and are repeated in the columns 1QS 1–4 and 1QS 10 (and see also 1QM). The metaphors are applied in several ways. In 1QS 2:11–17, those who do not wholeheartedly join the 'sons of light' (1QS 2:16) are cursed. In 1QS 3:3, it is stated that such persons take darkness as paths of light, *חושך יבט לדרכי אור*, and in 1QS 3:13 the 'sons of light' are to be

³⁸ Bauckham (1997:279) points to the fact that the dualistic language not only links the Gospel of John to the scrolls; the 'sons of light' or 'children of light' are also found in Lk 16:8; Eph 5:8; 1 Thess 5:5, in addition to Jn 12:36.

instructed about general anthropology, or the nature of 'all the sons of man', cf. כּוֹל בְּנֵי אִישׁ. In 1QS 3:20–21, the dualistic frame is employed as the Prince of Lights governs the sons of justice, i.e. those who walk in the paths of light, while the Angel of Darkness rules over the sons of deceit, i.e. those who walk in paths of darkness. The paths of darkness are also mentioned in 1QS 4:11 and the spirit of deceit that follows this path is described in detail in the previous lines. 1QS 10:2 speaks of 'vigils of darkness', אֲשֶׁמֹרֵי חוֹשֶׁךְ. Without doubt, this dualistic set of notions 'light and darkness' is the most essential expression of the negative attitude of the community towards 'outsiders'. The 'sons of light' are however, not described as perfect in principle, the Angel of Darkness may cause the 'sons of light' to fall (cf. the expression לִהְיוֹת כְּשֵׁל in 1QS 3:24) and deviation from the path is reckoned as a possibility (1QS 10:21).

In the description of segregation, selection and conflict we see that the community accentuates the conflict, cf. קִנְיָה רִיב (1QS 4:17–18), e.g. there is 'a violent conflict' concerning God's decrees since there are different opinions of it, cf. the expression יִחַדּוּ לִבָּם כִּי לֹא יֵחָדְלוּ 'since they do not walk together'. Thus, they are to be separated and segregated from the other side of the conflict (1QS 4:22; 5:1–2, 10, 18; 8:11, 13; 9:5–6; 11:7, 16).³⁹ The selection of members follows a divine plan (1QS 4:25). The reason for their sin is their lack of knowledge: 'and every matter hidden from Israel' (הַנִּסְתָּר מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל) (1QS 8:11) that are found by the Inspector. It is also stated that 'futile are all these who do not know his covenant', בְּרִיתוֹ הִבֵּל כּוֹל אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדְעוּ אֵת (1QS 5:19).

In the description of a universal perspective, the text includes the members with all men to a certain degree. The meaning of יִשְׂרָאֵל is however, ambiguous, it could denote the whole nation or the whole community (the entire movement). In 1QS 1:22 and 23, the theme is the sin of Israel, but there is nothing in the subsequent confession indicating whether the covenanters act on behalf of themselves or the whole nation. In 1QS 2:22, the theme of the passage in context is related to internal matters and should not be understood universally. In 1QS 5:5–6, the reference is probably inclusive 'in

³⁹ These passages all contain prescriptions of the segregation, e.g. 1QS 5:1b–2a says: 'They should keep apart from the congregation of the men of injustice', and 1QS 9:5b–6 'at that moment the men of the Community shall set apart a holy house for Aaron etc.'

order to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community of the eternal covenant', an observation strengthened by the next sentence 'they should make atonement for . . . the house of truth in Israel' and by 1QS 6:13 'and to any in Israel that freely volunteer'.

In the manifesto of 1QS 8:4; 8:12; 9:3 and 6, there is nothing that prevents a more universal understanding of the word. 'All man' in a universal meaning is presented on several places. The two spirits mentioned in 1QS 3:18 refer to every man on earth since the text refers to God's creation of man ('he created man', והוא ברא אנוש, 1QS 3:17), an expression that refers back to 3:13: 'all the sons of man' (כול בני איש). There are universal paths in 1QS 4:2 'and these are their paths in the world' (ואלה דרכיהן בחבל) while a further description in 1QS 4:15–16 says that this concerns the 'history of all men', cf. תולדות כול בני איש.

Several expressions are used to say that members and 'outsiders' are human beings on equal terms; they belong to the סוד רמה 'assembly of worms', and הולכי חושך 'those who walk in darkness' (1QS 11:10). The confession of sin at the beginning of the scroll (1QS 1:24ff) and a similar confession presented in a larger scale at the end (1QS 11:9ff) present the *covenanter* by saying that 'I belong to evil humankind, to the assembly of the unfaithful flesh' in 1QS 11:9: ואני לאדם רשעה ולסוד בשר עול. When it comes to certain basic characteristics, the *covenanter* despairs as he likens himself with the rest of the humankind. There is a difference, however, since he wants to be freed from the basic human conditions: 'in his justice he will cleanse me from the uncleanness of the human being and from the sin of the sons of man' in 1QS 11:14–15:

בצדקתו יטהרני מנדת אנוש וחטאת בני אדם.

We may conclude that on one hand the auto-designations and the internal rules demonstrate the awareness of uniqueness in the group. The terms in use all point towards a highly conscious notion of the members as members of a particular group, but do not explicitly reveal the view of the members towards 'outsiders'. In designations of non-members, we find a particularly negative attitude. In the expressions about the relationship between described insiders and outsiders, we find several attitudes that strengthen the impression of a separatist and elitist group. The dualistic category of 'light and darkness' expresses a detachment between themselves and those

outside making the group well aware of the existence of a conflict. There is, however, also a need for purification of the members, a feature of the texts that softens the impression gained from the dualistic terms and negative characterisations of 'others'.

8.2.4 *'Outsiders' in Other Texts*

Other passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls outside the Serek (1QS) may be divided into two kinds: a purely exclusive attitude and a less exclusive one. The purely exclusive position is indicated by the statements attesting a negative attitude towards 'outsiders'. The less exclusive position is indicated by those attesting a more positive attitude.

At certain points, we find universal aspects in the Dead Sea Scrolls, for instance in the expression 'all men' that points to a universal category into which some texts include the members of the group. The division between themselves and 'outsiders' is likewise not categorical in every respect, a conclusion that is also indicated by the identification of themselves as part of the darkness. At some places, we find expressions that speak of *portions* of light and darkness. The grading of people may be further derived from the fragments 4QHoroscope (4Q186 and 4Q561/4QHor ar) again indicating a less rigid division of 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. These fragments from cave 4 suggest the very important idea that the originators operate with portions of light and darkness *within* a man. If the portions of light are larger than the portions of darkness, it means that some men are determined to salvation and might become a member of the community.⁴⁰

This could mean that the Yahad was grading people according to these theories, and most important of all: it means that the theory of man and social boundaries were not rigidly dualistic. This assumption also indicates that the community was more accepted by their social-cultural environment than the strict 'sectarian' model suggests, an observation that is also in accordance with the impressions gained from the classical Essene sources (see above).

⁴⁰ See Martínez and Barrera (1995:37–38) where Martínez comments on the fragments 4Q186/4QHoroscope and 4Q561/4QHor ar. 4Q186 says for instance 'His spirit has six (parts) in the house of light and three in the pit of darkness' (frag. 1, 2:7–8), 'His spirit has [ei]ght (parts) in the house [of darkness], and one in the house of light' (frag. 1,3:5–6), see Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:380–383; 1998: 1116–1119).

The question of the attitude of the Qumran community towards *Gentiles* has been much discussed the past ten years. This question is of major importance. Hengel (1994) argues that the Gentiles were essential to, and not external from, the process of determining the identity of self in the early Jewish and Christian communities. The discussion seems, however, to follow ideological preferences, to an unacceptable degree.⁴¹ E. P. Sanders (1985:212ff) pointed out how the picture of the Gentiles in the Old Testament/Tanakh is not as negative as the traditional Christian picture wants it to be. There is a wide range of attitudes in the Prophets that also can be traced in later Jewish traditions and rabbinical material, except for the Dead Sea Scrolls. Concerning the Qumran community, Deines (1994) argues that the national particularism is not to be taken as expression of a fundamental xenophobia, but as being connected to the knowledge of God's acting in history. However, he also concludes: 'Wer aber solcherart die eigene Vervollkommenung zur Bedingung der Möglichkeit göttlichen Handelns macht, schliesst auf Dauer alle Heiden von Gottes Nähe aus' (1994:87). Fronrobert (1995) criticises Hengel, Deines, and others for employing the old Christian polemics of Israel's election as the criterion in their judgement of the situation:

Perhaps not intentionally so, but where the problem of universalism is formulated as whether God has an unmediated relationship with all of humankind or only with Israel (pp. 26, 87–88), the old theological polemics against Israel's chosenness lurk in the background.

She notes that in such instances Christian universalism is still held up as the model for the analysis of early Jewish texts. By comparing three kinds of practices, both from the Gospel of John and the writings of Philo and Qumran on an equal level, I hope to avoid hidden polemics. Again, I have to emphasise that my aim is not to track the historical reference to the notions of 'outsiders', but to track the general social attitude useful in a sociological comparison with the Gospel of John.

There is no mention of proselytes in 1QS, for example in the description of the hierarchy in 1QS 2:19ff—a passage where one would expect to find it if proselytes were allowed into the community. Beall (1988:36) uses 1QS 1:21–23; 6:13–14; 1QSa 1:1; CD 4:2,

⁴¹ See particularly the articles in Feldmeier and Heckel (1994) by Hengel (1994) and Deines (1994), but also Stegemann (1992b).

4 to argue that this passage limits the acceptance of members to Jews in a way that does *not* include Gentiles. Different passages can be presented that argue both in favour of and against the assumption. In some passages outside 1QS, we also find statements probably reflecting a very *negative* attitude towards non-members or ‘outsiders’. Some examples suffice to demonstrate the case.

There are negative references to proselytes when the texts speaks of Moses in relation to Exod 15:17–18 in 4QFlor:

This (refers to) the house into which shall never enter [...] for] ever either an Ammonite, or a Moabite, or a bastard, or a foreigner, or a proselyte, never, because his holy ones are there'.⁴²

The house (הבית) is an interpretation of Exod 15:17–18 that primarily refers to the temple but may have been interpreted as the community or as the sanctuary of men מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם (see for instance my comments in chapter 5). 4QOrdinances (4Q159) 2–4:2 seems to argue against contact with Gentiles saying that ‘They are [no]t to serve gentiles’, and in 11QTemple (11QT/11Q19) 48:11–12 there is a warning against the practice of Gentiles ‘And you shall not do as the gentiles do: they bury their dead in every place’. In CD 11:14b–15, the author writes that ‘no-one <should stay> in a place close to gentiles on the sabbath’. The passage reveals an exclusive attitude, but on the other hand also indicates that Gentiles do not represent the same problem on other days.⁴³

4QMMT (4Q394 Halakhic Letter^a) declares that ‘[None] of the wheat of the Gentiles shall be brought into the temple’.⁴⁴ Although the manuscript is fragmented and the overall context of the letter makes the statement somewhat difficult to catch, it certainly presents strict purity principles. 11QT 57:15b–17 argues against mixed marriages for the king:

And he shall not take a wife from among all the daughters of the nations, but instead take for himself a wife from his father’s house from his father’s family.

⁴² 4QFlor 1, 1:3–4, see Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997:353).

⁴³ See Deines (1994) on CD 11:12, 14.

⁴⁴ 4QMMT A. The composite text is arranged by Qimron and Strugnell (1994) in DJD series, 10:1–117. Cf. Martínez and Tigchelaar (1998:791) who reconstructs and translates ‘[...] and they defile it: you shall not eat] of the wheat of [the Gen]tiles, [and it shall not] be brought into the temple’ (3–7, 1:7–8).

In the War Scroll (1QM), the 'nations' is a notion describing the enemy, but it is not further stated what this meant for the Qumran community. We do find statements saying that the other peoples or nations, at least the wicked ones, are to be conquered in war. 1QM 12:11 encourages Israel to 'strike the peoples [גוֹיִם], your foes' and 1QM 14:7 says that 'By the perfect ones of the path all the wicked peoples shall be destroyed'. Josephus writes that the Essenes all were Jews by birth and in so doing, he indicates that this was not the case with other groups.⁴⁵ The history writer is probably right since the description is understandable when we consider it in relation to their strict rules of purity, but we cannot for that reason infer that they lived in isolation. These statements above all demonstrate a negative attitude towards Gentiles and other nations, but do not necessarily mean that they forbid intercourse with 'outsiders' on a daily basis even though this might have been an ideal.

We also locate a more *inclusive* attitude in statements in some writings, especially in the Damascus Document. These statements can be seen as necessary practical accommodations, but also as a principle resulting from social accommodation. CD 12:6b says that 'He is not to stretch out the hand to shed the blood of one of the gentiles for the sake of riches and gain'. CD 12:8b–9 also claims that: 'no one should sell an animal, or a clean bird, to the gentiles lest they sacrifice them'.⁴⁶ CD 14:3ff demonstrates an inclusion of proselytes:

Rule of the assembly of all the camps. All of them shall be enlisted by their names; the priest first, the levites second, the children of Israel third, and the proselyte fourth; and they shall be inscribed by their [na]mes, each one after his brother; the priest first, the levites second, the children of Israel third and the proselyte fourth.

Thus, Stegemann (1992b:128) points to the fact that CD 14:3–6 twice mentions proselytes among the members, and that this fact does not approve of the claim of Josephus regarding the covenanters' views of Gentiles. The use of the notion in 4QFlor 1, 1:4 (see above) may be looked upon as in accordance with the statement of

⁴⁵ τρίτον δέ, ὃ δὴ καὶ δοκεῖ σεμνότητα ἀσκεῖν, Ἑσσηνοὶ καλοῦνται, Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν γένος ὄντες, κτλ. '[and third] The Essenes have a reputation for cultivating peculiar sanctity. Of Jewish birth, etc.' (Josephus Bell. 2:119).

⁴⁶ This passage not only indicates a positive attitude towards the temple as I argued in chapter 5, but also towards Gentiles.

Josephus, but the reference to ‘the house’ (הבית) is ambiguous, and the assertion of Stegemann may very well be correct. Steudel (1994:31) translates נִר to German ‘Proselyt’ in CD 14:4, 6; Dimant (1986:170) translates in the same way. Knibb (1987:260) wonders: ‘Perhaps what is at issue here is exclusion from full membership’ and P. Davies (1994:75) would also translate ‘proselyte’ but thinks of one in the process of initiation, not a non-Jew. Stegemann (1992b:128) argues, on the other hand, that ‘nobody can doubt that this *ger* designates proselytes, i.e. members of the community who were born as gentiles.’ Obviously, some scholars do doubt that, see Beall (1988:37), but the insecurities concerning the reference of the term are themselves interesting from my point of view.

In a fragment from cave 1, we find an almost universal attitude. 1QMysteries (1Q27, 1QMyst) 1, 1:8bff says concerning the nations (העמים):

Do not all nations loathe sin? And yet, they all walk about under its influence. Does not praise of truth come from the mouth of all nations? And yet, is there perhaps one lip or one tongue which persists with it? What people would wish to be oppressed by another more powerful than itself? Who would wish to be sinfully looted of its wealth? And yet, which is the people not to oppress its neighbour? Where is the people which has not looted [another] of its wealth? . . .⁴⁷

If this fragment represents social attitudes of the Yahad, the last sentence indicates that the community was not generally hostile towards all ‘outsiders’.⁴⁸ In 4QP Nah (4Q169) 3–4, 2:8–9, the proselytes are also seemingly included, indicating that these were not disregarded in every way:

[Its] interpretation [con]cerns those who misdirect Ephraim, who with their fraudulent teaching and lying tongue and perfidious lip misdirect many; kings, princes, priests and people together with the proselyte attached to them.

Moreover, CD 6:21 expresses a philanthropic wish to help ‘others’: ‘for each to love his brother like himself; to strengthen the hand of the poor, the needy and the foreigner; for each to seek the peace’.

⁴⁷ See Hengel (1974a:220; 1974b:145, n. 711) who points to the implicit Hellenistic influence here in this passage of 1Q27.

⁴⁸ See Deines (1994) on CD 12:6–11.

Here the foreigner is positioned among the 'outsiders' to whom one is to show mercy. A similar inclusive attitude is found in 11QT 40:5.⁴⁹ Regardless of the actual reference to 'foreigner' in these passages, the inclusive attitude is evident.

Examples of a more exclusive attitudes is found in 4QOrdinances and 4QFlor,⁵⁰ and a reluctant attitude towards foreign rulers is evident in 11QT.⁵¹ Parts of 4QFlor might indicate that they could have contact with foreigners without fearing God's punishment, but they are warned that the strangers might lead them away from God.⁵² Many of these examples have biblical models, see e.g. Deut 17:14ff. Nevertheless, it is important that these rules and commandments are re-stated in this way, and although we are not able to detect their reference, their meanings are more or less clear in connection with a study of social characteristics in comparison with John and Philo.

Other examples could be presented, but these suffice to demonstrate that the negative attitudes first observed are softened and that the general impression gained from other passages reflects a more modest view concerning the social relationships of this community, at least some time during its history.

8.2.5 *Inclusive or Exclusive?*

The notions 'others' and 'outsiders' were introduced to have general concepts that describe social relationships behind the writings. There are two main pictures of the community drawn by Qumran scholars.

⁴⁹ 11Q19 '[...] You shall make a thi[r]d courtyard [...] [...] to their daughters and for foreigners, who were bor[n ...] etc.' where the foreigners are included, cf. 4QFlor 1, 1:3-4.

⁵⁰ 4QOrdinances^b (4Q513) 1-2, 2:1-2 'to let them touch the pure [ho]ly food, for [they are] unclean [...] ladies of sons of foreigners and all fornication which [...] he cho[se] for himself, etc.' 4QFlor 1, 1:2ff says that 'This (refers to) the house which [he will establish] for [him] in the last days, as is written in the book of [Moses: 'The temple of] YHWH your hands will est[a]blish. YHWH shall reign for ever and ever'. This (refers) to the house into which shall not enter [...] for] ever either an Ammonite, or a Moabite, or a bastard, or a foreigner, or a proselyte, never, because his holy ones are there.'

⁵¹ (11QT^a) 56:14-15 'then you shall set over yourself a king/whom I shall choose./ From among your brothers you shall set over yourself a king; you shall not set over yourself a foreign man who is not your brother'.

⁵² In 4Q501 (4QApocryphal Lamentations B), we find bitter lamentations concerning foreigners [עַמִּי] in line 1 (Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998:992). See also 1Q27Myst 1:8-12.

Some regard the external relationships in the Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran as strict and rigid (Hengel, Deines), while others point towards the group as being *less* isolated (Stegemann, Weinfeld).

The Qumran passages presented above show also two sets of general attitudes towards 'outsiders'. 1QS presents generally a very strict picture of social relationships when it comes to the attitudes towards 'others', a fact that probably demonstrates the fundamental scepticism towards 'others' in the movement. Nevertheless, the way in which 1QS presents the 'outsiders' and the ways other manuscripts present the relation of the alleged community and their environment, are ambiguous. In 1QS, the 'outsiders' are mostly negatively presented. However, the members of the community seem partly to place themselves on the same level as the 'outsiders' (cf. the confession of sin). CD is relatively more positive since some of the statements in this writing bear witness to a merciful attitude and inclusion. 4QMMT demonstrates positive attitudes towards the addressees, but rather negative towards 'Gentiles'. 1QM and 11QT are strong in their rejection of other nations, while 4QFlor expresses a particularly negative attitude towards possible 'outsiders'. The most negative attitudes regarding statements dealing with the fate of the 'nations' are often attached to a language of war—as in 1QM. On a personal level, however, the tone does not seem to be that harsh.

One might solve this problem of ambivalence or mixed attitudes in several ways, dependent on the overall understanding of the Qumran texts and their discovery. If the caves were parts of a library (Cross 1995), various kinds of literature would find their way in. If the movement existed for more than 200 years, these Essene writings would naturally reflect different stages of development in their history. Theoretically, it could also relate to changing addressees of the writings. Nevertheless, the positive statements soften the picture of a totally insulated movement. We find no extreme xenophobia; we do find a possible opening for non-Jews, and even the dualistic expressed division of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' is not totally categorical.

8.3 SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS IN JOHN, PHILO, AND QUMRAN

Conclusions from the previous and present chapter must reflect the fact that in all these text-corpora (John, Philo, and Qumran) we find different and even conflicting kinds of statements concerning

‘others’, a fact that seems confusing at first, but that might be well explained sociologically.

The common ideological dualism seen in Qumran texts and in the Gospel of John points to ideological similarities—perhaps also reflecting common attitudes and practices. However, the Qumran evidence studied above points towards a community of a different sort than does the Johannine text. There is a scholarly consensus that in the Qumran texts we find reports clearly telling us that the stated relationships towards ‘outsiders’ were basically negative and at times highly tense. We find some counter evidence that bears witness to a general mixture of high and low tension, but the major part of the testimonies describes a group in high tension with its surroundings. Although the Qumran writings also indicate a certain social interaction and accommodation to the society at large, the ideological differences are not only marked. There are nevertheless, hostile antagonism and expressions referring to a social isolation that we do not find to the same degree in Philo and John.

Comparing these results with the results from my evaluation of social relationships in texts of Philo and John, it is easy to conclude that these text-corpora share a similar more positive attitude. We cannot tell for sure if the Qumranic Yahad accepted proselytes in the first century CE, but we know almost for certain that Philo did. John does not clearly explain his attitude towards non-Jewish persons who were not proselytes, but there are statements that can refer to an attitude of invitation to join the faith, much in a similar way to Philo when he presents a friendly attitude to some ‘others’. As indicated by John’s use of words like ‘the Samaritans’ and ‘the Greeks’, the community has an open attitude towards these ‘others’. The negative expressions in John concerning ‘others’ like ‘Jews’ and ‘the world’ find parallels in Philo in other connections as well. Philo discards native Egyptians, while John does not mention any particular group in that same general way. The relationship towards the ‘Jews’ in John is of a special character, and is still well explained by the assumption that the community was, or had been, in conflict with a local synagogue.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSIONS

9.1 GENERAL RESULTS

The debate concerning the alleged group behind the Gospel of John has mainly been concentrated on explaining idiosyncrasies and an exclusiveness seen in the Gospel that suggest a partly isolated and segregated community, a description often connected to the ‘*sect model*’. I have challenged the ‘sectarian’ view on the Gospel while at the same time accepting the Martyn-Brown hypothesis of an expulsion from a local synagogue, and I have presented different sociological models as alternative explanations for the Gospel background, particularly the ‘cult’ model. Two relational aspects of the community were chosen to test the ‘sectarian’ claim: *the relationship to the Jerusalem temple and social relationships to named ‘others’ or ‘outsiders’*. In addition, I have studied its degree of organisational level in an evaluation of the existence of a community behind the Gospel (chapter 3).

In chapter 2, I formulated three guiding sociological questions for the investigation: significant are questions regarding tension, innovation versus refurbishment of traditional practice and belief, and the question of stress on similarities and differences. The chosen features (temple and named ‘others’) are naturally not sufficient to present a general and complete picture of the community in relation to these sociological questions. Nevertheless, they describe aspects that represent essential features in any definition of a ‘sect’: the relationship to the main institution of the parent body, and the group’s social boundaries. In addition, they are less discussed in the scholarly debate on the *Sitz im Leben* (in a broad sense) of the Gospel. Other aspects of the group have been touched upon that already have a long history in the study of the Gospel: its dualism, Docetism, Gnosticism, the relationship towards the synagogue, the ‘Jews’, the ‘cosmos’, internal love versus external hatred, in addition to or in combination with theological features such as those pointing towards an esoteric Christology. A total description of the group behind the Gospel should include the history of the group, its relation to the

'world' in general, the social function of the myths, the relationship to other Christian groups, the constituency, group organisation, forms of worship, etc. Nevertheless, I have argued that my chosen features are essential for a description of the social nature of the community and for testing the 'sectarian' claim.

The discussion regarding social segregation or isolation of the Johannine community has taken two main different directions. Meeks (1972) has studied statements reflecting the attitude towards the world or society in general with his analysis of the social functions of the Redeemer myth. In chapter 1, I presented several objections to this 'sectarian' stance of Meeks. Above all, Meeks was challenged by Brown (1979) who evaluated the community's relationship with other Christians and concluded that the Johannine Christians had not broken communion with the Christian movement at large. In this way, Meeks on the one side and Brown on the other, represent two alternative trends or ways of describing the Johannine community, seen also in later investigations:

1. A segregated and exclusive or 'sectarian' way, and
2. a *less* segregated and exclusive or 'semi-sectarian' one.

Since evidence is so restricted, this discussion of the nature of the community should not be studied internally alone, but in comparison with texts from about the same period, i.e. Philo and Qumran texts, the nearest examples besides Josephus and the New Testament itself. In any discussion of social characteristics, 'control groups' will influence the results negatively or positively. The task was not primarily to see how the ideas of the temple and 'others' relate between the studied texts, but how the expressed view on the temple may be said to reflect a social reality and how different practices may be compared between the groups in question even when their texts are written in different genres.

I have argued that the three groups of texts studied evolve three different ways of relating to temple Judaism and to 'others' that come to expression in the formulated reasons for the tension as well as in the degree of tension. Moreover, there is a *pattern* in these relationships with John in the middle and with Philo and Qumran on each side:

- a. On a scale from high organisational level to low organisational level, the Johannine community may be located in the middle

compared to Qumran and Philo as seen in the texts studied above. We have the relatively little organised Philo community on the one side, and the highly organised Qumran community on the other. We know that the Jewish Alexandrians were well organised and probably gathered often in the prayer houses or synagogues. The impression gained from my reading of Philo's texts indicates that he was part of this milieu, despite his elitism—a view shared by most Philo scholars today. Where organisational level is concerned, Philo and John are more similar in this respect than Qumran and John.

- b. A similar pattern is also found when we consider the relationship to the temple institution. Philo's attitude towards temple Judaism is in one way as ambivalent as John's. In the end, Philo nevertheless demonstrates temple loyalty, a fact that demonstrates that the temple institution was generally hard to abandon and that turns all kinds of temple criticism less sure as arguments for a total temple rejection, even by the Johannine Christians. The Qumran community was clearly in more high tension with the parent body on this matter than Philo and John, but even here, the rejection does not seem to be total.
- c. When it comes to tension in connection with social relationships seen in attitudes towards named 'others', the Johannine evidence may again be located in the middle on the scale, but closer to Philo than to Qumran, although they all present mixed tensions.

The investigation has demonstrated that there are two main challenges whose solutions must be found in a description of the Johannine community on the basis of these questions and this general pattern.

On the *one* hand, we must find a way to combine the multi-shaped relational aspects of the community seen in the text. There is a *relatively* low expressed tension towards traditional temple Judaism and a mixture of tensions in the external relationships towards non-members, i.e. we find statements reflecting a high-tension attitude and statements reflecting less tension. The main observations leading to this conclusion are:

1. The particular way of acceptance and re-interpretation of the temple ideas found in John, and
2. the effect of the synagogue conflict including the partly pejorative use of words like 'Jews' and 'cosmos', *combined* with

3. an inclusive attitude towards named 'others' like Greeks (Gentiles or not) and Samaritans.

This is the 'both-and' attitude that makes the Gospel of John appear ambivalent to us, but the text reflects more conflicts than school theory can explain with its stress on 'discussions'.

Modern sociological models have been criticised for lack of discriminatory power, lack of precision and reflection, Christian prejudice, and other un-stated ideological agendas. Some of the objections have been refuted as inaccurate in light of the latest development in the sociology of religion. In addition, other objections concern the applications of the model only, not the model itself, and can therefore be disregarded by avoiding them. On the basis of my observations presented above it is important to find an explanation that makes it possible to see the mixture of low, middle and high tension in the Gospel in an overall perspective.

On the *other* hand, it is also essential to find an explanation that may locate and relate my picture of the comparison texts of Philo and Qumran to the above described pattern of relationships in John.

9.2 EARLIER APPLICATIONS OF DIFFERENT 'SECT' MODELS

As I argued in chapter 1 and 2, the application of 'sect' models has a long history in the sociology of religion and in New Testament studies but has been criticised both in sociological and biblical literature. The general non-sociological definition of the notion that is much used in scholarly works often refers to a plain group with both a low organisation level and little coercion. This definition is, however, methodologically dubious since it reflects an unconscious use of the notion and therefore functions arbitrarily. The notion had a long history also before it was picked up by early sociologists—a history that might explain both its wide range of references and its unconscious use by biblical scholars. A semi-sociological application is found that refers only to deviant *ideas*. The problem is not references to ideas, notions, and language as such, but the reductionist lack of a wider perspective that is today naturally accompanied by a notion shaped and dominated by sociology. Several 'sectarian' investigations by Johannine scholars were presented. The main problem with these studies is that they take the relationship towards the

temple Judaism in a too evident and negative way, and that the multi-dimensional social relationships to 'others' in John are not properly included in their analysis.

In addition to the general problems connected to the 'sect' model in many biblical studies presented the last 30 years, there are also serious problems with Meeks' (1972) textual analysis and conclusions regarding the social nature of the community as 'sectarian'. First, I have made observations that strengthen the theory of a close connection to the 'parent body' through the expressions related to temple adherence and in combination with the acceptance of the synagogue (seen implicitly in the ejection from the synagogue). The observations also confirm a mixture of low and high social tension in relation to 'others'. These observations all point in a different direction than the rude 'sectarian' categorisation, with a community captured in a 'sectarian' circle that aggravated its isolation and exclusive peculiarities also of ideas. Second, the comparison with Philo and Qumran reveals similarities and dissimilarities suggesting a pattern making the Johannine community appear both less exclusive than Qumran community, and more exclusive than Philo and his fellow Alexandrian Jews, the Philo community. This comparison is the main reason for me to conclude that Meeks' picture of the Johannine community is one-sided. If the level of exclusiveness and segregation of the Johannine community was relatively lower than in the Qumran community, the 'sectarian' notion in connection with John must be reconsidered. This conclusion is more in compliance with the semi-'sectarian' tendency in Brown's thesis (1979).

My point of departure was the recent development in the sociology of religion concerning new religious movements. I argued that there are two promising models today from my point of view, (1) the 'sect' model based on the theories of B. Wilson particularly as these are developed by Elliott, and (2) R. Stark and W. Bainbridge's 'sect' model.

9.3 THE 'SECT' MODEL BY WILSON AND ELLIOTT

The most up-to-date evaluation of a 'sect' model applied to the New Testament generally is Elliott's use of Wilson's typology. The application of the traditional way of defining the 'sect' by Elliott (e.g. 1998, 2001) is a theory that is more adaptive to the individual

characteristics of the New Testament than earlier formulated 'sect' theories. I shall consider the Johannine parts of Elliott's application against the main results of my investigation concerning the two main issues studied above.

Elliott's analysis is particularly interesting in regard to what he calls criticism and rejection of the 'establishment', the maintenance of social cohesion, and the introversionist withdrawal from society as well as some of its accompanying 'sectarian' strategies. I have analysed the question of exclusion and the criticism of the 'establishment' in relation to the reported synagogue conflict. The question of replacement of institutions is in these texts naturally connected to the question of the relationship to the Jerusalem temple. In addition, I have studied the question of recruitment and maintenance of social cohesion through an evaluation of the attitudes towards 'others'. Elliott (1998) presents several conclusions from these theories on early Christianity that are *not* in accordance with my observations on the particular Johannine evidence. When it comes to tension and exclusion, he rightly pictures the tension and its causes. There is clear evidence of an increase in social tension and ideological difference (e.g. Torah observance, Temple allegiance, harassment/punishment by Jewish authorities) also in John. As he points out, the temple allegiance, or lack of it, is a feature causing tension and it is indicated in all the gospels. According to my observations, however, the demand of temple allegiance is not a main issue causing severe tension for the Johannine community. While the text indicates distance to the temple institution, it does not indicate a rejection of the temple as institution or of the entire temple Judaism. Moreover, the exclusion from the synagogue that the Gospel refers to has to be considered within the overall Johannine picture; it was an exclusion from the synagogue that was *not* caused by an initial rejection of the synagogue by the members of the Johannine community. On the contrary, if there were a conflict, it seems rather to be the synagogue that reacted against the new insights that the community presented.

Concerning recruitment, Elliott rightly sees that the reports of recruitment of certain persons and groups in the Gospel of John can be characterised as 'inclusive'. The consequence is that the general relationship to 'others' cannot be regarded as only exclusive and this fact must also be taken into consideration when we discuss the proper model. Concerning authenticity, the early church, probably includ-

ing the Johannine community, seems to think that it alone embodies the authentic identity of Israel. But at least for the Johannine community the claim represents an innovation and thus a very extraordinary way of fulfilment, clearly different from what is indicated in the Qumran writings. In the Gospel of John, there are few signs of the type of radical replacement of the temple institution that Elliott describes. Generally, the temple was not easily done away with by Jews in this period as witnessed by Philo and Qumran (in addition to Josephus and several other later Jewish writings). The temple had a strong theological and social position, filling more than one function.

An adequate description of the community must be able to explain the ambivalent willingness to co-exist in some way as Brown (1979) argues. A characterisation of the community must also explain the fact that its members were rejected *by* the synagogue, but at the same time explain the fact that the Gospel does not show any traits of a rejection *of* the synagogue. In addition, the characterisation must be able to explain the relationship to the temple in a situation where the critical statements concerning the temple cannot be seen as expressions of a rejection only. The temple was probably destroyed when the final version of the Gospel was completed, yet the temple institution is for that reason not necessarily uninteresting for the community.

Elliott's application of the 'sect' model explains several of these Johannine particularities, but the way he employs this model also means that it becomes extremely broad. He seeks to prove the 'sectarianism' of the early church by its *openness* (1998:292) to other nations and cultures, thus operating with a very wide definition of 'sect'. He indicates that other Jews were not open in like manner, but there are clearly similarities between Philo and John in this matter. Since the evidence from Philo points in a similar direction of openness, this criterion at least lacks discriminatory power in relation to Philo. Nevertheless, the attitudes towards the temple and towards 'others' are also central features within the set of questions asked by Elliott—particularly the questions connected to responses to the world describing different 'sectarian' sub-categories in Wilson's theory. A combination of *the introversionist response*, which focuses on the renunciation or withdrawal from society both by individuals and groups, and *the reformist response*, which focuses on a reformation of the social order according to supernaturally-given insights, seems to

be a possible solution to explain the peculiar mixture of tension and of relationships in the Gospel. However, even though this solution will account for the Qumran evidence, Philo cannot be placed within this scheme at all.

This solution is awkward since expressions of new insights and expressions with stress on former traditions reflect two different kinds of reform, each with different responses or social consequences. Other sociological theory urges us to distinguish between these kinds of reform groups.

9.4 THE 'CULT' MODEL

9.4.1 *A Circular Argument?*

The 'cult', 'cult-sect', or 'parent body-cult-sect' model has been established from contemporary modern empirical investigations through a systematic study of how modern new religions emerge. The 'church' is the group in low tension with its social environment or the social environment of its 'parent body'; the 'cult' and the 'sect' are in high tension. The 'cult' is the social group that represents the beginning of a new religion. It is different compared to the traditional order as it claims to possess a new revelation or new insight changing the traditional one. The 'sect' represents splinters from the indigenous tradition that will regenerate the old order; it claims to represent the authentic, purged, and refurbished tradition (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1985:23ff).¹

The 'cult' model is grounded on general perspectives that make it potentially relevant for the understanding of the emergence of new religious movements elsewhere in other times—such as the first century. The model cannot in itself explain anything in the ancient world, but it can help us to understand and find new aspects of the texts and their social background. Similarly to Wilson's 'sect' categories, these categories from the 'cult-sect' or 'parent body-cult-sect' model now avoid the objections raised against the typical Christian and theological criteria that so often implicitly governed the concept of 'sect' earlier.

¹ Ashton (1991:132) reveals a confusion of concepts in relation to the theories of R. Stark and Bainbridge, when he concludes that the Gospel of John tells of the birth 'of a new sect, or, to slant the matter differently, of a new religion'.

A methodological problem at this stage of my evaluation is the circular argument involved. The 'cult' model of R. Stark and Bainbridge was one of the major starting points for my investigation. It is, perhaps, no wonder that it now turns up to correspond well with my conclusions. We must remember, however, that circular arguments can never be avoided; we can at best only confront our results with our presuppositions, a task that is much easier when these are made explicit from the beginning. The basic questions to the text formulated in chapter 2 are not only a result of the starting point: these questions have a history in the Johannine scholarship independent of this model. The relationships towards the 'parent body' and social relationships to 'others' are also essential features in any discussion of deviant groups' characteristics, independent of the choice of sociological model, and these relationships are highlighted by the Gospel itself. Elliott's analysis of the early church as 'sectarian' also demonstrates that these perspectives are not uniquely tied to the 'parent body-cult-sect' model.

9.4.2 *The Qumran Community Was 'Sectarian'*

In my evaluation of the communities in question, I have studied four areas (chapter 2) and two issues in particular:

1. The community's awareness of being a distinct group,
2. its relationship to the indigenous tradition represented by the temple in Jerusalem,
3. its social relationships to 'others', and
4. its social relationships to 'others' in an evaluation of its general relational tension.

In the case of the Yahad seen in Qumran texts, the matter of temple relationship and its social consequences offer the essential test vis-à-vis the indigenous tradition. One can *not* say that the Yahad was a 'cult' if it was representing the same or similar temple cultus as the one found in leading parties of Jerusalem, or if it demanded a refurbishing of institutions and members and the members isolated themselves socially (and perhaps also geographically if we accept a strict Qumran Essene hypothesis). I have argued in favour of theories saying that the group behind the Qumran texts studied, the Yahad, is a distinct group, best demonstrated by their internal rules

for membership in the Serek. The Yaḥad is also a deviant group, in that it protested at least against the ruling calendar in the temple and probably against all cultic implications of this calendar. The transference of the temple functions to the group itself was not the reason for their deviance, but came as a *result* of it.

The question of separation gives a much more ambiguous impression than the question of general deviance. My analysis strengthens the theories (e.g. by Stegemann 1992b; 1994) that argue that although in opposition to the temple, one cannot say that the group responsible for the scrolls had broken completely with it and that the community therefore had isolated themselves from their fellows and their indigenous tradition. The transference of the temple functions does not indicate a complete break, and the hostility expressed in the texts to everything impure to the cultus did not prevent them from arguing by referring to ancient texts saying that one could interact with Gentiles. Perhaps the Qumran community even accepted proselytes. If the transference is to be regarded as an innovation, the innovation had clear models in the scriptures and was not the reason in itself for their schism with the temple. The Yaḥad was not a 'cult'.

For the Yaḥad to be a 'sect', Stegemann (1992b) thinks that the group had to have different halakot than other Jewish group at the time, and such halakot did not exist, he claims. According to my definition, the group was a 'sect' if the texts advocated a refurbished set of halakot that the members of the community wanted others to accept. Their deviance does not concern what the members of the community believed to be the temple religion but rather what the members of the community thought was a mere destruction of this temple religion, a conflict probably going back to the time of the Maccabees. The negative and dualistic expressions and the ambivalent impression the texts sometimes give of their attitude towards the opponents of the group, the aim of separation and their mostly negative attitude towards other nations, foreigners and proselytes, are also arguments in favour of defining the Yaḥad as 'sectarian'. Moreover, the reactions against defilement of the temple may explain their expressed attitudes towards 'others'; it is part of the same paradigm of concerns about purity.

Thus, according to the definition of 'sect' by R. Stark and Bainbridge, the Yaḥad was a 'sect'; it was a segregated and deviant group, wanting to refurbish the 'mother religion' or 'parent body'. If it was a main Jewish union, it did *not* represent the dominating

temple Judaism at the time of origin of the texts that I have studied or the ideas behind them. This wish to refurbish the temple religion does not indicate a total neglect or isolation, and several passages present a quite ambivalent temple attitude that should warn us against being too categorical. Nevertheless, the degree of tension seen in the isolation and the wish for a temple refurbishment at least validate the conclusion that the group was 'sectarian' according to this definition.

9.4.3 *Philo Represents the 'Parent Body'*

Obviously, a modern and preconceived model does not always shed light on the texts and the social situation, and this is the case when it comes to the Alexandrian Jews as Philo in relation to my chosen models.

The 'parent body-cult-sect' model presupposes distinct groups, or organised deviant groups. Mainly due to the lack of information both in the corpus Philonicum and outside, it is, however, difficult to conclude that Philo was part of such an organised group. The different views on the Law, the prescriptions, or the ancestral traditions that Philo presents nevertheless strongly indicate different directions among these Diaspora Jews of Alexandria. The essential significance of the model from R. Stark and Bainbridge in relation to these directions is its ability to identify purifying versus innovating tendencies. In relation to the Johannine and Qumran communities, the analysis of Philo's standpoint has also given valuable help by contrasting the evidence from his writings with writings from these other groups.

In depicting a map of Alexandrian Jewish groups or directions (see chapter 3), I pointed to the fact that scholars have found four group leanings in the city regarding attitudes towards traditional Judaism with 1. neglecting literalists, 2. neglecting allegorists, 3. faithful allegorists, and 4. faithful literalists. Among both the faithful and more unfaithful ones we find literalists and allegorists. Those who completely neglected the customs of the indigenous tradition may be called 'apostates' and these stood on separate wings of the socio-religious landscape among the Jews in Alexandria, the literalist 'apostates' on one side, and the allegorising 'apostates' at the other extreme. The groups still operating within the 'mother religion' or 'parent-body' are the groups 3 and 4, and the members of the community probably all were part of synagogal communities of Alexandria in one way or another.

The analysis has shown that the Alexandrian groups in question had both 'sectarian' and 'cultic' tendencies in their relationships to the indigenous tradition. One group may be designated as 'cult', i.e. the allegorical negligent ones (or 'apostates'). Philo himself and his fellows may be designated as a direction or group with some 'cultic' tendencies, i.e. with innovations that tended to break with the indigenous tradition. However, Philo can never be said to have wanted to violate the boundaries of his indigenous tradition. At the end, we see that he represents a kind of temple Judaism above in his support to the paying of the temple tax.

The writings of Philo present an author that mainly supports the customary Diaspora temple observance despite all his criticism and even rejection of the temple institution. Philo and his fellow Alexandrian Jews of his sort ('the Philo community') may therefore be said to represent the 'parent body'. Nevertheless, the mixture of low and high tension to different kinds of other worship and worshippers is disturbing the picture, and Philo's temple transference also points in the direction of deviance. In the end, Philo is clearly on the 'parent' side of the scale and the fact that he after all remained *within* what he looked upon as the boundaries of his parent body, turns out to be more important than the fact that he was on the verge of rejecting it.

9.4.4 *The Johannine Community Was 'Cultic'*

The main problem with the Fourth Gospel from a historical-critical point of view has always been its distinctive character compared to other early Christian writings, characteristics that may best be explained as results of experiences of a community in conflict with its surroundings. A distinct group behind the Gospel can only be indirectly inferred from the Gospel of John. Compared to the core Qumran writings, the Gospel of John does not present itself as a product of a similar highly organised group with strongly formulated rules regulating their boundaries. Compared to Philo, on the other side, John presents itself as a writing in a more dynamic and interactive relation to the experiences of a particular milieu or group and its traditions connected to a version of the story of Jesus. The presentation of a group behind the Gospel is in many ways much more evident than a group behind Philo's writings although he too, comments on the political conflict of the Jewish group in Alexandria in his polit-

ical treatises and particularly for that reason, Philo indirectly presents himself as part of a larger social entity in Alexandria.

As stated above, in the model described by R. Stark and Bainbridge (1985) on the 'cult' formation, the 'cult' is described as the group that de facto starts a new religious movement or a new religion. In fact, the 'sect' according to this 'cult-sect' model, may also turn into a new religion, but the transformation to a new religion is then described as a transformation with characteristics typical for the 'cult'. This means that according to this typology every new religion in one phase of its history of development has been a 'cult' or at least 'cult'-like. Applied to the Gospel of John, this perspective above all highlights the innovative aspects of a new movement, and it helps us to see some of the features of the Gospel as social consequences of these innovations. The Johannine community seems to have become part of a new organisation living independently of its origin.

Elliott (1998:303) admits that 'from the perspective of Greco-Roman society especially beyond the land of Israel, Christianity is seen by pagans as a foreign eastern cult among many'. In this way, the categorisation of the entire early church turns out to be relative to the perspective, which is not a particularly interesting solution in a study of a gospel like John with all its particularities. Therefore, what should be discussed further is if the Johannine community is better categorised as 'cult' from the perspective of a temple Judaism and from the perspective of social relationships.

Some New Testament scholars have earlier formulated conclusions in their studies of the early church that are in one way in accordance with the 'cult' thesis. Holmberg concludes (1978:146), that 'A charismatic movement not only calls the existing society into question but also in principle is nothing less than the founding anew of a society'. In one way, an institutionalisation always includes a novelty and one may turn the conclusion around and look at the contents of the movement as new inventions. This is also the essence of the results of Theissen and the similarities with the conclusions of Theissen (1999:185ff) are striking. Theissen argues that 'primitive Christians' developed a new sign system able to replace the earlier cultus made inaccessible because of the destruction of the temple. These are evident in the creation of new rites, baptism and Eucharist, a new basic narrative, and a new ethic that can be described by the metaphor of sacrifice: the sacrifice of praise, mutual help, and the sacrifice of the martyr (1999:156ff). I take Theissen's conclusions to

support my own when he asks for and finds the novel aspect of Christianity while preserving its integrity in traditional Judaism. In connection with the Gospel of John, Theissen (1999:205) concludes, 'this new religion '[primitive Christianity] not only actually organizes itself around its christological centre but comes aware of this'.² The Johannine community found itself as a part of the general Christian movement despite its idiosyncrasies; Peter is after all accepted as a disciple although the Beloved Disciple is presented as the hero, and Jesus is presented as praying for a unity in Jn 17:20–21 (Brown 1979:90). Brown concludes rightly, I think, that John was 'not back-water but rather in mainstream confrontation with the synagogues and other churches' (1979:7). In this light, the presentation of the temple relationship is then not as ambivalent as we may think. A community with new practice and belief like the Johannine is naturally interested in presenting itself as a continuation of the parent body, visible above all in its temple relationship.

A detailed comparison between modern and ancient phenomena has not always been illuminating, as the criticism of the 'sect' model by New Testament scholars demonstrates. R. Stark and Bainbridge's categorical way of defining a type or model, however, does not demand a detailed correspondence between modern and historical groups. I have argued that for this reason the way that they have constructed and employ the model, it is particularly promising; with its general perspective and clear-cut criteria, it does not lack discriminatory power. These sociologists have themselves used the criteria of innovation versus refurbishment as social criteria, not as ideological ones. The innovation or refurbishment can also be measured socially; a general tendency among new religious movements

² A similar perspective is also indicated by articles in Bilde and Rothstein (1999a) that compare new religions in the Greco-Roman era and today. Bilde (1999:153) (in Danish) also employs the distinction between 'sect' and 'cult' taken from Stark (he does not mention Bainbridge) and uses the ejection from the synagogue as witnessed in John as an example of 'the definite parting' between 'church' and 'synagogue' (1999:151) (my translation). He suggests that Christianity with Jesus started out as a 'sect' that turned into a 'cult' in the period after 50 CE, after 70 CE or even after 110 CE. He compares the early Jesus movement with the Qumran movement and concludes that they were both 'sects' according to Stark's definition. He does not evaluate alternative models connected to the Jesus movement, such as 'faction', cf. chapter 1 and he does not place the Gospel of John into the picture, although he, by referring to the ejection from the synagogue, seems to take the Gospel to represent early Christianity generally.

today may turn out to be a fruitful way of studying an ancient one without expecting a detailed correspondence.

The main question of category that has to be answered first is whether the attitudes evident in the Gospel of John towards the temple and 'others' are innovative aspects of temple Judaism or refurbishing? To answer this question, I shall compare common characteristics and social strategies found in the modern 'cult' (chapter 2) with my observations from the Gospel of John. These features are not criteria for the definition and categorisation of the Johannine community, but examples of 'cultic' strategies today. Concerning the observations on new authorities and charismatic leaders, these observations are possible ways of analysing the Gospel of John, but the material is too scarce to have any determining effect.

A. 'Cult' and 'sect' are in tension with society at large

The observation of 'tension' is in accordance with the impression from the Gospel of John. Several passages reveal this tension, including some of the particular passages or issues studied above (chapters 4–8).

The comparison with Philo and Qumran indicates that the Johannine community was a middle, and not high-tension group regarding the temple relationship. The typical characterisation for this temple relationship is what I have named a 'conjunction' model. A conjunction model is in itself not particularly 'sectarian' nor 'cultic' but the innovative aspects of this kind of Christianity favour a 'cultic' understanding. The lack of clear evidence of a rejection of the temple or extreme temple tension like the one in Qumran, also indicates that we should not categorise the Johannine group as 'sect'. Other conflicts, however, force our judgement of the Johannine community towards the end of the tension scale. It is particularly presented in the Gospel in passages referring to an ἀποσυνάγωγος (9:22; 12:42; 16:2) of the believers in Jesus. Every expression of hatred, dualism, and exclusiveness is also expressing high tension.

B. The 'cult' is a schismatic group by new revelation

When it comes to the reason for the tension and the evident schism, the modern examples reveal a difference between two kinds of groups, the one called 'sect' and the other called 'cult'. My observations indicate that the Johannine community did not reject the temple in principle, nor did the members of the community look upon their own

faith as a purged and refurbished edition of temple Judaism. The community is, therefore, according to this classification, *not a 'sect'*. It could be looked upon as a group that claimed to be authentic, but as long as this claim is based upon a new insight, the group must be looked upon as similar to a modern 'cult' in this respect.

C. *Creation by innovation (mutation)*

The new claims made by the Johannine community are based upon an innovation or mutation within temple Judaism and not by importation from another culture or country. My investigation has not been directed to the first level of the history, the level of the historical Jesus, but mostly to the second level, the level of the community. Thus, I have not analysed what might have been the original source of this innovation in the Jesus movement. At the level of the Johannine community, only the consequences of the innovation may be observed and analysed historically, not the first move towards innovation itself. At this second level of analysis, the difference between the temple Judaism and the Johannine community is best characterised as an innovation.

Even though the Gospel argues that Jesus fulfilled the scriptural expectations by saying that the scriptures testify on his behalf (5:39), this is not adequate for us to classify this attitude as a refurbishing attitude towards temple Judaism. Revitalisation and fulfilment are not equivalents.

D. *From innovation to tension*

When a 'sect' today is described as a group that is in tension with the established order, because it presents itself as a fulfilment of that order, this meaning of 'fulfilment' is not the same as the 'fulfilment' observed as a central feature in the Johannine faith. There is little difference between the 'cults' and 'sects' of today when it comes to the level of tension, but there is clearly a difference when it comes to the reasons for and the direction of the tension. For the Johannine community it is the new beliefs in relation to the status of Jesus that creates the tension with traditional Judaism both before and after the temple destruction. The tension is not so visible in relation to the temple institution as in the relation to the local synagogue. When a tense situation develops, sociologists today argue that the 'sect' tends to stress differences, while the 'cult' tends to stress similarities. Throughout the Gospel, the Jewish frame of the stories is presented,

e.g. in Jn 2:13–22, the story of the temple cleansing, a fact that I look upon as a stress on similarities.

E. *The need for legitimating*

It is the need for legitimating that may explain the ambivalence found in both 'cult' and 'sect' according to this theory since the need for legitimating is an important observed difference between 'sect' and 'cult' today. My conclusions from the observations on the legitimating or justification of the relationship towards the temple in the Fourth Gospel are in accordance with this modern tendency. I have argued that the Johannine attitude towards the scriptures may stand as a model for our understanding of the attitudes towards the temple as well. In 5:39, John argues that the scriptures testify on the behalf of Jesus. A positive attitude towards the temple institution as well as towards the synagogue institution is also indicated by the fact that, according to John, it was the synagogue (leaders) that initially rejected the community and not the community that rejected the synagogue. In addition, the invitation to some 'others' to join the community points in the direction of accommodation and a low tension. This accommodation creates a further need for legitimating, and the dialectic and centrifugal process is started towards further innovations in practice and belief. By accepting and criticising the temple institution at the same time, and by developing alternatives, the community demonstrates typical cultic strategies.

F. *Accommodation to the culture at large*

The accommodations to the culture at large form one essential part of the strategies of a 'cult'. In this case, however, the 'cult' is often different from the 'sect' as the 'sect' protests against any such accommodation. The attitude revealed in the Gospel as being inviting towards certain named 'others' (possibly Greeks and Romans) might be looked upon as such an accommodation in practice. However, we cannot say for sure if these 'others' were non-Jews; all we can conclude from this observation is, in fact, *the inclusive attitude*. In a situation of conflict (cf. the statement in 17:14 'the world has hated them because they do not belong to the world'), the Johannine community demonstrates its accommodation by statements reflecting the willingness to be sent *into* the world (cf. the statements in 17:15 'I am not asking you to take them out of the world' and 17:18 'As you have sent me into the world, so I have sent them into the

world'). If the statements of 9:22; 12:42; 16:2 reflect an expulsion, and I will say they do, the willingness to stay in the world (cf. 'not out of the world') is, after all, essential and is a feature that the 'cult' model helps us to see. It is in statements like those in Jn 17:15 that the conscious and unconscious 'sect' model appears to dominate the understanding of John for so many scholars, and it is exactly here that the 'cult' model demonstrates its fruitfulness as an alternative reading.

The relationship to the 'others' as represented by the Greco-Roman culture at large seems in Philo and John to be of a similar type. Together with expressions of an exclusive attitude in other passages, the inclusive ones make up a mixed attitude or strategy that in fact has much in common with the evidence from Philo. One of the central differences between the 'cult' and the 'sect' is precisely the attitude of accommodation. In the 'sectarian' protest, the 'sect' cannot accommodate, while the 'cult' has to accommodate. Philo represents attitudes that, in comparison, show more resemblance to John than to Qumran in this respect. Philo may then expose an essential difference between the Johannine and the Qumran communities concerning accommodation.

Interesting for my analysis are also the theories concerning success of new religious movement (R. Stark and Bainbridge 1987; Bainbridge 1997:409ff). New religious movements are likely to succeed to the extent that they retain *cultural continuity* with the conventional faiths of the societies in which they appear or originate, and maintain a *medium* level of tension with their surrounding environment; deviant, but not too deviant (Bainbridge 1997:411). As stated above, it is also important to observe whether the group stresses similarities ('cult') or differences ('sect'). Both the 'cult' and the 'sect' demonstrate similarities and differences, but since the 'cult' innovates, similarities become important in reducing tension. Since the 'sect' refurbishes, differences tend to become vital. I look upon the Johannine community as a group that tried to keep a middle level of tension also in the time after the destruction of the temple, but that did not succeed well in that task. Nevertheless, in that situation, stress on similarities was still important to survive.

Several modern examples of emerging new religions, the 'cults', correspond to observations above on the Gospel of John and its alleged background milieu, the Johannine community. The basic modern criteria for the categorisation may lead into further theo-

retical insights. Any correspondence tends to strengthen my conclusion, although I am not basing the argument on the polythetic or the monothetic categorisation. A monothetic group of phenomena is so defined that the possession of a unique set of attributes is both sufficient and necessary for the categorisation. A polythetic categorisation demands, on the other hand, only some common attributes out of many. The force of arguments is therefore not dependent on more or less complete correspondence in these details.

The 'cult' model may above all help us to understand the ambiguity found in the Gospel concerning the relationship to the indigenous tradition, to temple Judaism, and the relationship to 'others'. For this simple reason alone the notion of 'cult' is promising for the discussion. It demonstrates that the conflict is a conflict 'within the family', but also amplifies the differences and the core of the problem, innovations that caused the reactions which again caused exclusivism. The novelties of the Johannine community and early Christianity are in this way emphasised without blaming the 'Jews', an important factor in today's Christian hermeneutics (see Reinhartz 1998). The circle 'reactions-isolation-exclusivism' is not as totally devastating or vicious as Meeks claimed, since on the other hand, there are open attitudes towards some 'others' demonstrated *inter alia* in the stories concerning named 'others' like Greeks and Samaritans. The dialectic development that scholars like Meeks (1972) and Barrett (1972) have exploited is helpful, but in any dialectic movement the result of the development is dependent on its basis and I suggest a partly different basis. The stated openness towards some 'others' seen in the Gospel is also a part of the basis and must be seen as a modifying factor in the Johannine development, which is also the reason for its great importance in my social scientific based judgement of the community. Since the First Johannine Epistle concentrates on the internal schism of the community, the reader is distracted to think that the members of the community were totally isolated, but the lack of information must not distract us in this matter.

This is important for the understanding of the community's ethos. Elliott (1993) describes the positive results of the 'sectarian' model and Barton (1993) points to features of the ethos that the 'sect' model may demonstrate and explain.³ There are, however, also other

³ Examples given by Barton (1993:146–147) are:

features that the 'sect' model tends to *hide*, clearly visible in the features studied in this investigation. The 'cult' model combines all these features and adds another perspective to them; the 'cultic' features are different from features seen in writings from a community like the one behind the core Qumran writings. When it comes to social features, the relationship to the 'parent body' exemplified by the statements related to the temple institution and the relationships to 'others', John seems to have more in common with Philo than with Qumran. It is essential that the 'cult' model or the 'parent body-cult-sect' model helps us to settle some essential differences between the Johannine community, the Qumran community and the Jewish milieu in Alexandria as indicated by Philo. If modern sociological models should have any profit at all, they should be able to distinguish groups with both similar and different practice and beliefs like these three.

In relation to the two ways of describing the social characteristics seen in the Gospel of John explained above, the exclusive way represented by Meeks and others, and the inclusive solution as represented *inter alia* by Brown, my conclusions suggest yet another solution. The Johannine community is neither an exclusive 'sect' nor a mere inclusive group. In order to explain what looks like a confused nature of the group, its ambivalence towards the temple tradition and 'others', its relationship towards the parent body and its mixed attitudes towards 'others', the 'cult' model is ideal. By innovations of the community as seen in the Gospel, its tension with and accommodations of the community, it seems to have features in common with the general description of a modern 'cult'. The stress on similarities in combination with all its innovated differences in this model also fit the picture of the community we gain from the Gospel. The picture of a medium tension is of course not in accordance with the picture of the synagogue conflict itself, but the friendly or inviting attitude towards some 'others' indicates that the members of the community also wanted to reduce tension.

I have in mind, for example, the strongly centripetal character of the love commandment; the emphasis on humility and equality in inter-personal relations dramatized in the episode of the footwashing (John 13:1–20); the predominant orientation of the Johannine symbols on nurture, sustenance, abiding and unity, the charismatic emphasis on the availability of the Spirit-Paraclete to the members of the group; and the overwhelmingly pessimistic outlook on relations with 'the world' and its institutional manifestations, whether Jewish or Roman.

The essential point is not this categorisation in itself, but how the model makes us see the connection between the high tension, the temple acceptance and the inclusive attitude towards certain persons or groups of persons but not towards others. The low tension in relation to some people indicates that the group was not a pure 'sect' according to the definitions above. The innovations inherent in the christological formulations in the Fourth Gospel certainly created high tension (in their relationships the synagogue milieu and the 'Jews'), but they also created a low tension in social relationships to 'others'. When the temple was destroyed, the effect of these innovations was gradually acknowledged by the community and the parting of the ways was then inaugurated.

The Johannine community is *not a 'cult'* since the evidence for the existence of the group is too scarce to conclude that it was, since we have too little direct information on their ideas and attitudes and since only modern groups can be 'cults' (or 'sects' or part of a 'parent body' for that matter). If it could be shown that the early Christians and the Johannine Christians or even Jesus himself, had formally replaced the temple in principle and neglected its observances (see e.g. Ådna 2000), the 'cult'-hypothesis would in fact be further strengthened, but too many observations point in another direction. However, it is fruitful to *compare* the alleged group with a modern 'cult'.

The Johannine community is '*cultic*' or 'cult'-like for many reasons:

1. There are several high-tension issues pointing towards some kind of deviance with its 'parent body'.
2. This high tension is 'cultic', not 'sectarian' because the tension is resolved by an innovation and not by a wish to refurbish the traditional worship. Even if the community claimed that it alone embodied the authentic 'parent body', this is quite a different attitude than the one seen in writings found at Qumran. Today the difference is taken care of by using the label 'cultic' for the Johannine community. The innovations must have prepared the ground for an independent institutionalisation after the destruction of the temple by the Romans in 70 CE, but the Gospel only indicates this later phase in its development.
3. The mixed social attitudes of relationship to 'others' came probably as a result of the situation awakened by the innovations and the reactions against it. The text as seen from this

perspective, demonstrates that the community was, after all, not in a high-tension relationship in every respect. There seems to be a connection, not only a correspondence, between temple adherence, the innovations, the rejection by the local synagogue, the expressed hatred, the accommodation to the world, stress on similarities and this more inclusive attitude.

The 'cult' model that I have applied is a variant of a general sociological 'sect' model, but the differences I have pointed at between the communities analysed in this investigation are arguments for concluding that the none of the 'sect' models described above are adequate tools for characterising these differences. The 'sectarian' way of characterising the background of the Gospel of John that points towards a totally exclusive and segregated community cannot be upheld, while the picture of a community in a serious conflict with the dominant part its 'parent body' at that time must be upheld. Both the temple relationship and the relationships to 'others', like the Samaritans and alleged Greeks and Romans, are indications in the Gospel of a different social nature than the 'sectarian'. The 'cultic' nature particular comes to expression in a comparison with writings of Philo and from Qumran. The 'cult' model above all helps us to see as historically understandable both the common traits of the community with its parent body (critical loyalty to the temple), the particularities in social attitudes and theology, its exclusiveness and inclusiveness, its open invitations as well as its isolation.

APPENDICES

ABBREVIATIONS AND TEXT SOURCES

The system of reference follows common practice in sociological literature (author/year of publication) with full information in the literature list of all referred literature. However, I have introduced some additions from the standard system of reference in biblical studies, i.e. in some cases the full or short titles of the books and articles are also presented in the main text or in the footnotes to make the text more user-friendly (particularly in chapter 1).

Abbreviations have been kept to a minimum and writings not abbreviated are not mentioned in the list below.

A. *Bible*

English names, abbreviations, and quotes are in accordance with the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV 1993). Texts from the Septuagint (LXX) are from the edition of Rahlfs (1979). Greek quotes of New Testament are from Aland, Aland, Karavidopoulos et al. (1993).

B. *Philo*

Greek quotes and English translations of Philo's writings are in accordance with the texts from Loeb Classical Library (Philo 1929–1953) translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, R. Marcus et al., if not otherwise stated.

Shortened Latin titles of the writings of *Philo* and their full equivalents are in accordance with the standards as defined in Runia (1996:223–224):

Abr. = De Abrahamo
Aet. = De aeternitate mundi
Agr. = De agricultura
Cher. = De Cherubim
Conf. = De confusione
linguarum

Congr. = De congressu eruditionis gratia	Post. = De posteritate Caini
Contempl. = De vita contemplativa	Praem. = De praemiis et poenis, De execrationibus
Decal. = De Decalogo	Prob. = Quod omnis probus liber sit
Det. = Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet	Prov. = De Providentia
Deus = Quod Deus sit immutabilis	QE = Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum
Ebr. = De ebrietate	QG = Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim
Flacc. = In Flaccum	QG isf. = Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim incertae sedis fragmenta
Fug. = De fuga et inventione	Sacr. = De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini
Gig. = De gigantibus	Sobr. = De sobrietate
Her. = Quis rerum divinarum heres sit	Somn. 1 = De somniis I
Hypoth. = Hypothesica	Somn. 2 = De somniis II
Ios. = De Iosepho	Spec. 1 = De specialibus legibus I
Leg. 1 = Legum allegoriae I	Spec. 2 = De specialibus legibus II
Leg. 2 = Legum allegoriae II	Spec. 3 = De specialibus legibus III
Leg. 3 = Legum allegoriae III	Spec. 4 = De specialibus legibus IV
Legat. = Legatio ad Gaium	Virt. = De virtutibus
Migr. = De migratione Abrahami	
Mos. 1 = De vita Moysis I	
Mos. 2 = De vita Moysis II	
Mut. = De mutatione nominum	
Opif. = De opificio mundi	
Plant. = De plantatione	

C. *Dead Sea Scrolls*

Shortened transcribed and English titles of the writings from Qumran and other Essene writings and their full equivalents are in accordance with the standards as defined in Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997; 1998), and so are the Hebrew and English quotes if not otherwise stated.

D. *Josephus*

Abbreviations and shortened Latin titles of the writings of Josephus and their full equivalents are in accordance with the following:

Bell. = De Bello Judaico

Antiq. = Antiquitates Iudaicae

Contra Ap. = Contra Apionem

Text quotes from Josephus are from the Loeb Classical Library series (Josephus 1926–65) translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, M. Wikgren et al.

E. Mishnah, Talmud, and Related Literature

Information concerning other citations and abbreviations, see footnotes in the chapters in question.

m. Ber. = Mishnah Berakot

m. Nid. = Mishnah Niddah

m. Sukkah = Mishnah Sukkah

t. Sukkah = Tosefta Sukkah

t. Sabb. = Tosefta Sabbath

b. Git. = Babylonian Talmud tractate Gittin

Lam. Rab. = Midrash Rabbah Lamentations

Gen. Rab. = Midrash Rabbah Genesis

b. Ber. = Babylonian Talmud tractate Berakot

Mek. on Exod = Mekilta on Exodus

F. Plato

Texts from Plato, and short titles are from the Loeb Classical Library series (Plato 1914–1936) translated by H. N. Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb, P. Shorey et al.

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

- Aalen, S. 1964. "‘Truth’, A Key Word in St. John’s Gospel," *Studia Evangelica* 2. Edited by F. L. Cross. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 87. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 3–24.
- Abercrombie, N., S. Hill and B. S. Turner, (eds.) 1994. *Dictionary of Sociology*. London: Penguin.
- Accordance. 2000. *Computer Text and Search Program*. Version 4.3. Vancouver: Oak Tree Software Specialist/Gramcord Institute.
- Ådna, J. 1989. Tempel, 1533–1541. *Das grosse Bibellexikon*. Edited by H. Burkhardt. Wuppertal/Giessen: Brockhaus Verlag.
- . 1993. *Jesu Kritik am Tempel. Eine Untersuchung zum Verlauf und Sinn der sogenannten Tempelreinigung Jesu, Markus 11, 15–17 und Parallelen*. Dissertation presented at the Norwegian Lutheran School of Theology, Oslo.
- . 1999. Jesus’ Symbolic Act in the Temple (Mark 11:15–17). The Replacement of the Sacrificial Cult by his Atoning Death," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 461–73.
- . 2000. *Jesu Stellung zum Tempel. Die Tempelaktion und das Tempelwort als Ausdruck seiner messianischen Sendung*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 119. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Aland, K., M. Black, C. Martini, et al. (eds.) 1975. *The Greek New Testament*. (3rd edition). New York: United Bible Societies.
- Amir, Y. 1983. *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandria*. Neukirchen, Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Anderson, H. 1976. *The Gospel of Mark*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan and Scott Publishers.
- Anderson, P. N. 1996. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel. Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 78. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Armstrong, K. 1996. *Jerusalem. One City. Three Faiths*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Arnaldez, R. 1961. *Philon. Introduction generale. De opificio mundi*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 1. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Ashton, J. (ed.) 1986. *The Interpretation of John*. Issues in Religion and Theology 9. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania/London: Fortress Press/SPCK.
- . 1991. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Astren, F. 2001. "The Dead Sea Scroll and Medieval Jewish Studies: Methods and Problems," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8, 105–123.
- Aune, D. 1976. "Orthodoxy in Judaism in the First Century Judaism? A Response to N. J. McEleney," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7, 1–10.

¹ The style of the references and of the list of literature is based on the ‘Author-Date’ style.

- . 1997. *Revelation 1–5*. Word Biblical Commentary 52. Dallas: Word Books.
- . 2003. "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica*. Edited by D. Aune, T. Seland and J. Ulrichsen. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 106. Leiden: Brill 281–303.
- Avemarie, F. 1999. "Ist die Johannestaufe ein Ausdruck von Tempelkritik? Skizze eines methodischen Problems," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 395–410.
- Baasland, E. 1984. Urkristendommen i sosiologiens lys. *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke* 55, 45–57.
- . 1991. Nye metoder i eksegese. *Ung Teologi* 24, 1–19.
- Bacon, B. W. 1910. *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate. A Series of Essays on Problems concerning the Origin and Value of the Anonymous Writings Attributed to the Apostle John*. New York: Moffat, Yard and Company.
- Bainbridge, W. S. 1997. *The Sociology of Religious Movements*. New York: Routledge.
- Barclay, J. 1995. "Deviance and Apostasy. Some Applications of Deviance Theory to First-Century Judaism and Christianity," in *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Edited by P. F. Esler. London: Routledge 114–127.
- Barrett, C. K. 1972. "The Dialectical Theology of St. John," in *New Testament Essays*. Edited by C. K. Barrett. London: SPCK 49–69.
- . 1978. *The Gospel According to St. John. An Introduction with Commentaries and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: SPCK.
- . 1989. "School, Conventicle, and Church in the New Testament," *Wissenschaft und Kirche. Texte und Arbeiten zur Bibel* 4. Edited by K. Alan and S. Meurer. Bielefeld: Luther-Verlag 96–110.
- Barton, S. 1993. "Early Christianity and the Sociology of the Sect," in *The Open Text. New Directions for Biblical Studies*. Edited by F. Watson. London: SCM Press 140–62.
- . 1998. "Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?," in *The Gospels for All Christians. Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by R. Bauckham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark 173–94.
- Bauckham, R. 1997. "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is There a Connection?," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After*. Rochampton Institute London Papers 3. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26. Edited by C. A. Evans and S. E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 267–79.
- . (ed.) 1998. *The Gospels for All Christians. Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Bauer, W. 1933. *Das Johannesevangelium*. (3. verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage.) Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. (2nd edition). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Baumgarten, A. 1995. "Rabbinic Literature as a Source for the History of Jewish Sectarianism in the Second Temple Period," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 2, 14–57.
- . 1997. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era. An Interpretation*. Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism 55. Leiden: Brill.
- Beall, T. S. 1988. *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R. 1987. *John*. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Waco, Texas: Word Books.

- Beavis, M. A. 1989. *Mark's Audience. The Literary and Social Setting of Mark 4.11–12*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- Bekken, P. J. 1998. *The Word is Near You. A Study of Deuteronomium 30:12–14 in Paul's Letter to the Romans against the Background of Philo's Exposition in De Virtutibus and De Praemiis et Poenis*. Dr. art. avhandling, Det historisk-filosofiske fakultet, Institutt for religionsvitenskap [sic]. Trondheim: NTNU Trondheim.
- Belle, G. van. 1988. *Johannine Bibliography 1966–1985*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 82. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters.
- . 1994. *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel. Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium 106. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters.
- Berger, K. 1977. "Wissenssoziologie und Exegese des Neuen Testaments," *Kairos* 19, 124–133.
- . 1984. *Exegese des Neuen Testaments. Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung*. Uni-Taschenbücher für Wissenschaft 658. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.
- . 1987. *Einführung in die Formgeschichte*. Uni-Taschenbücher 1444. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- . 1997. *Im Anfang war Johannes. Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums*. Stuttgart: Quell Verlag.
- Berger, P. 1954. "The Sociological Study of Sectarianism," *Social Research* 21, 467–485.
- . and T. Luckmann. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin.
- Bergmeier, R. 1980. *Glaube als Gabe nach Johannes*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. 6. Folge 12. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- . 1993. *Die Essener-Berichte des Flavius Josephus. Quellenstudien zu den Essenertexten im Werk des jüdischen Historiographen*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Best, T. 1983. "The Sociological Study of the New Testament. Promise and Peril of a New Discipline," in *Scottish Journal of Theology* 36, 181–194.
- Betz, H. 1997. "Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15–18). A Comparative Religion Approach," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116, 455–72.
- Betz, O. 1993. "Qumran and the New Testament. Forty Years of Research," *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Volume 1 of 2 volumes edited by Z. J. Kapera. Krakow: The Enigma Press 79–100.
- Bibelen. 1985. *Den Heilage Skrifta, Bibelen, Det gamle og Det nye testamentet*. (2nd edition). Oslo: Det Norske Bibelselskap.
- Bietenhard, H. 1951. *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Bieringer, R., D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville (eds.) 2001a. *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.
- . 2001b. "Wrestling with Johannine Anti-Judaism. A Hermeneutical Framework for the Analysis of the Current Debate," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum 3–37.
- Bilde, P. 1990. "Tradition og nybrud i det jødiske Palæstina i hellenistisk tid," in *Tradition og nybrud. Jødedommen i hellenistisk tid*. Forum for bibelsk eksegese 2. Edited by P. Bilde. København: Museum Tusculanum Forlag, Københavns Universitet 11–64.
- . "Ny vin på nye flasker? Grundlæggelsen av kristendommen som en ny religion i hellenistisk-romersk tid," in *Nye religioner i hellenistisk-romersk tid og i dag*. Edited by P. Bilde and M. Rothstein. Århus: Aarhus University Press.
- . and M. Rothstein, (eds.) 1999a. *Nye religioner i hellenistisk-romersk tid og i dag*. Århus: Aarhus University Press 148–76.

- . 1999b. "Om at definere nyere religioner i fortid og nutid. Overvejelser over begreber og metoder," in *Nye religioner i hellenistisk-romersk tid og i dag*. Edited by P. Bilde and M. Rothstein. Århus: Aarhus University Press 1–23.
- Billings, T. H. 1979. *The Platonism of Philo Judaeus*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Birnbaum, E. 1996. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought. Israel, Jews and Proselytes*. Brown Judaic Studies 290. Studia Philonica Monographs 2. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . 2003. "Allegorical Interpretation and Jewish Identity among Alexandrian Jewish Writers," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica*. Edited by D. Aune, T. Seland and J. Ulrichsen. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 106. Leiden: Brill 307–29.
- Blasi, A. J. 1991. Review of B. Holmberg *Sociology and the New Testament*. *Sociological Analysis* 52, 215–216.
- . 1996. *A Sociology of Johannine Christianity*. Texts and Studies in Religion 69. New York: Edwin Mellen.
- Blass, F. and A. Debrunner (eds.) 1965. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Blenkinsopp, J. 1981. "Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism. An Aspect of Second Temple History," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press 1–26.
- Boer, M. C. de. 1996. *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 17. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.
- Bogart, J. 1977. *Orthodox and Heretical Perfectionism in the Johannine Community as Evident in the First Epistle of John*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 33. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- Boismard, M.-É. and A. Lamouille. 1977. *L'Évangile de Jean. Commentaire*. Synopse des quatre évangiles en français 3. Paris: Cerf.
- Boissevain, J. 1974. *Friends of Friends. Networks, Manipulators and Coalitions*. Pavilion Series. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Bonani, G. 1994. "Report and Discussion Concerning Radiocarbon Dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences 441–53.
- Borg, M. J. 1984. *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 5. New York: Edwin Mellen.
- Borgen, P. 1965. *Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 10. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1977. "Some Jewish Exegetical Traditions as Background for the Son of Man Saying in John's Gospel (3:13–14) and Context," in *L'Évangile de Jean. Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 44. Edited by M. de Jonge. Gembloux: Duculot 143–258.
- . 1980. "Observations on the Theme 'Paul and Philo'. Paul's Preaching of Circumcision in Galatia (Gal. 5:11) and Debates on Circumcision in Philo," in *Die Paulinische Literatur und Theologie. The Pauline Literature and Theology*. Edited by S. Pedersen. Århus/Göttingen: Forlaget Aros/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 85–102.
- . 1984a. "Philo of Alexandria," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period. Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2:2. Edited by M. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press 233–82.
- . 1984b. "Philo of Alexandria. A Critical and Synthetical Survey of Research since World War II," in *Religion. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im*

- Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 98–154.
- . 1987. *Philo, John and Paul. New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Brown Judaic Studies 131. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . 1990. “John and the Synoptics,” in *The Interrelations of the Gospels*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 95. Edited by D. L. Dungan. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters 408–37.
- . 1991. “The Sabbath Controversy in John 5:1–18 and Analogous Controversy Reflected in Philo’s Writings,” in *Heirs of the Septuagint. Philo, Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity. The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 3. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 230. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 209–22.
- . 1992a. “Judaism in Egypt,” in volume 3 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday 1061–72.
- . 1992b. “Philo and the Jews in Alexandria,” in *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization* 3. Edited by P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle. Århus: Aarhus University Press 122–38.
- . 1992c. “Philo of Alexandria,” in volume 5 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday 333–42.
- . 1992d. “There Shall Come Forth a Man’. Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo,” in *The Messiah. Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press 341–61.
- . 1993. “John 6. Tradition, Interpretations and Composition,” in *From Jesus to John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements Series 84. Edited by M. C. de Boer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 268–91.
- . 1996a. “The Gospel of John and Hellenism. Some Observations,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John*. Edited by A. R. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster Press 98–123.
- . 1996b. “In Accordance with the Scriptures,” in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Edited by J. Barclay and J. Sweet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 193–206.
- . 1996c. “Philantropia [sic!] in Philo’s Writings. Some Observations,” in *Biblical and Humane*. Edited by L. B. Elder, D. L. Barr and E. S. Malbon. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 173–88.
- . 1997. *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 86. Leiden: Brill.
- , K. Fuglseth and R. Skarsten (eds.) 2000. *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill.
- Böttrich, C. 1999. “Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes.’ Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 411–25.
- Bousset, W. 1906. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Bowman, J. 1975. *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews. A study in R. Akiba, Esther and the Gospel of John*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 8. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press.
- Braun, H. 1966a. *Qumran und das Neue Testament* 1. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1966b. *Qumran und das Neue Testament* 2. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Bréhier, É. 1925. *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d’Alexandrie*. 2. édition revue. Étude de philosophie médiévale 8. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.
- Brodie, T. L. 1993. *The Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel. A Source-Oriented Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Brooke, G. J. 1985. *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- . 1999a. "The Past. On the History of Dead Sea Scrolls Research," in *Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings. Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 9–27.
- . 1999b. "The Scrolls and the Study of the New Testament," in *Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*. Proceeding of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings. Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 61–76.
- . 1999c. "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 285–301.
- Brown, R. E. 1966. *The Gospel According to John (1–12). Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible 29. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1970. *The Gospel According to John (13–21). Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. The Anchor Bible 29A. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1978. "Other Sheep not of this Fold'. The Johannine Perspective on Christian Diversity in the Late First Century," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1, 5–22.
- . 1979. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in NT Times*. New York: Paulist Press.
- . 1982. *The Epistles of John. Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 30. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1988. *The Gospel and Epistles of John. A Concise Commentary*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press.
- . 1994. *The Death of the Messiah. From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narrative in the Four Gospels*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1997. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday.
- Brownlee, W. H. 1951. *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. Translations and Notes*. Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplementary Studies 10–12. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Bull, K.-M. 1992. *Gemeinde zwischen Integration und Abgrenzung. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Ort der Johanneische Gemeinde(n) in der Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 24. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Bultmann, R. 1925. "Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunder der älteren Kirche* 25, 100–146.
- . 1950. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. (1. Auflage 1941). Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1971. *The Gospel of John. A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press.
- . 1984. *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. 9. Auflage, durchgesehen und ergänzt von Otto Merk. (1. Auflage 1948). Uni-Taschenbücher 630. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Burge, G. M. 1987. *The Anointed Community. The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- . 1992. *Interpreting the Gospel of John*. Guides to New Testament Exegesis 3. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books.
- Burke, P. 1992. *History and Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Burrows, M. 1951. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*. Edited for the Trustees by Millar Burrows with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee. New Haven: American School of Oriental Research.
- . 1956. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Secker & Warburg.
- Bury, R. G. 1926. *Plato. Laws*. Volume 11 translated by R. G. Bury. Plato in 12 volumes. Translated by H. N. Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb, P. Shorey et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Busse, U. 1997. "Die Tempelmetaphorik. Als ein Beispiel von implizitem Rekurs auf die biblische Tradition im Johannesevangelium," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 131. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters 395–428.
- Carmignac, J. 1956. "L'utilité ou l'inutilité des sacrifices sanglants dans la 'Règle de la communauté' de Qumrân," (Avec un commentaire de J. T. Milik, page 532), *Revue biblique* 63:524–532.
- . and P. Guibert. 1961. *Les textes de Qumran. Traduits et annotés. La règle de la communauté. La règle de la guerre. Les hymnes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.
- Carson, D. A. 1988. "John and the Johannine Epistles," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 245–64.
- . 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester/Grand Rapids, Michigan: InterVarsity Press/Eerdmans.
- Casey, M. 1996. *Is John's Gospel True?* London: Routledge.
- Cazeaux, J. 1965. *Philon. De migratione Abrahami*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 14. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf 156–222.
- . 1984. "Philon d'Alexandrie, exégète," in *Religion. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 156–226.
- Charlesworth, J. H. 1991a. "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Christian Origins Library. (Enlarged edition of *John and Qumran*, 1972). New York: Crossroad 76–106.
- . (ed.) 1991b. *Jesus' Jewishness. Exploring the Place of Jesus within Early Judaism*. Shared Ground among Jews and Christians 2. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania/ New York: American Interfaith Institute/Crossroad.
- . (ed.) 1991c. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christian Origins Library. (Enlarged edition of *John and Qumran*, 1972). New York: Crossroad.
- . 1993. "Reinterpreting John. How the Dead Sea Scrolls Have Revolutionized Our Understanding of the Gospel of John," *Bible Review* 9, 18–25.
- . (ed.) 1994. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translations 1. Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen/Louisville, Kentucky: Mohr/ Westminster John Knox Press.
- . 1995. *The Beloved Disciple. Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.
- . 1996. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gospel According to John," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*. Edited by A. R. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 65–97.
- Chilton, B. 1991. "[ὡς] φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων (John 2:15)," in *Templum Amicitiae. Essays on the Second Temple*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 48. Edited by W. Horbury. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press/Sheffield Academic Press 330–44.

- . 1992. *The Temple of Jesus. His Sacrificial Program Within a Cultural History of Sacrifice*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University.
- . 1994. *A Feast of Meanings*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 72. Leiden: Brill.
- , and J. Neusner. 1995. *Judaism in the New Testament. Practices and Beliefs*. London: Routledge.
- Christiansen, E. J. 1995. *The Covenant in Judaism and Paul. A Study of Ritual Boundaries as Identity Markers*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 27. Leiden: Brill.
- Christiansen, I. 1969. *Die Technik der allegorischen Auslegungswissenschaft bei Philon von Alexandrien*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik 7. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Cohen, N. G. 1995. *Philo Judaeus. His Universe of Discourse*. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des Antiken Judentums 24. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Cohen, S. J. D. 1987. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Library of Early Christianity 7. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press.
- Cohn, L., P. Wendland and S. Reiter (eds.) 1896–1915. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Unverändert Nachdruck 1962. Berlin: Reimer.
- Collins, J. J. 1974. *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 13. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- . 2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem. Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Michigan, Livonia: Eerdmans/Dove.
- Colson, F. H. 1937. *Philo. De Decalogo, De specialibus legibus 1–3*. Volume 7 translated by F. H. Colson. Philo in 10 volumes and 2 supplementary volumes. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and R. Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . 1941. *Philo. Quod omnis probus liber sit, De vita contemplativa, De aeternitate mundi, In Flaccum, Hypothesica, De providentia*. Volume 9 translated by F. H. Colson. Philo in 10 volumes and 2 supplementary volumes. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and R. Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- , and G. H. Whitaker. 1932. *Philo. De confusione linguarum, De migratione Abrahami, Quis rerum divinarum heres sit, De congressu eruditionis gratia*. Volume 4 translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Philo in 10 volumes and 2 supplementary volumes. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and R. Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Craffert, P. 2001. "An Exercise in the Critical Use of Models. The 'Goodness of Fit' of Wilson's Sect Model," in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible*. Edited by J. Pilch. Leiden: Brill 21–46.
- Cross, F. M. 1995. *The Ancient Library of Qumran*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- , and E. Eshel. 1997. "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran," *Israel Exploration Journal* 47, 17–28.
- Cruse, C. F. 1998. *Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History. Complete and Unabridged*. Translated by C. F. Cruse. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Cryer, F., J. Høgenhaven and G. Doudna. 1997. "Dødehavsrullerne-halvtreds år efter. En orienteringsartikel," *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 60, 218–234.
- Cryer, F. and T. L. Thompson, (eds.) 1998. *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- Cullmann, O. 1951. *Les Sacrements dans l'Evangile Johannique. La vie de Jésus et le culte de l'église primitive a vie de Jésus et le culte de l'église primitive*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

- . 1958–1959. “L’opposition contre le temple de Jerusalem, motif commun de la théologie johannique et du monde ambiant,” *New Testament Studies* 5, 157–173.
- . 1975. *Der Johanneische Kreis. Sein Platz im Spätjudentum, in der Jüngerschaft Jesu und im Urchristentum. Zum Ursprung des Johannesevangeliums*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Culpepper, A. R. 1975. *The Johannine School. An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 26. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press.
- . 1985. *1 John, 2 John, 3 John*. Atlanta, Georgia: Know Preaching Guides.
- . 1987. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel. A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- . 1994. *John the Son of Zebedee. The life of a Legend*. Studies in Personalities of the New Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- . 1996. “The Gospel of John as a Document of Faith in a Pluralistic Culture,” in *‘What is John?’ Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Edited by G. R. O’Day. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 107–27.
- . 2001. “Anti-Judaism in the Fourth Gospel as a Theological Problem for Christian Interpreters,” in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Van Gorcum 61–82.
- Dahl, N. A. 1962. “The Johannine Church and History,” in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Brothers 124–42.
- . 1963. *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums. Mit einem Vorwort zum Neudruck*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . 1990. “Do not wonder!” John 5:28–29 and Johannine Eschatology Once More,” in *The Conversation Continues. Studies in Paul & John*. Edited by R. T. Fortna and B. R. Gaventa. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press 322–36.
- Danby, H. D. D. 1933. *The Mishnah. Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Daniel, S. 1975. *Philon. De specialibus legibus 1 et 2. Introduction, traduction et notes*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 24. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Daniélou, J. 1958. *Philon d’Alexandrie. Les temps et les destins*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard.
- Daube, D. 1956. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. Jordan Lectures in Comparative Religion 2. London: University of London/The Athlone Press.
- Daumas, F. and P. Miquel. 1963. *Philon. De vita contemplativa. Introduction et notes. Traduction*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 29. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Davies, P. R. 1983. *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the ‘Damascus Document’*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 25. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- . 1994. “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism,” in *Pursuing the Text*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 184. Edited by J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 70–84.
- . 1995. “Was There Really a Qumran Community?,” *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 3, 9–35.
- . 1996. *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 134. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Davies, W. D. 1974. *The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- . 1996. "Reflections on Aspects of the Jewish Background of the Gospel of John," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*. Edited by A. R. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 43–64.
- Deines, R. 1994. "Die Abwehr der Fremden in den Texten aus Qumran. Zum Verständnis der Fremdenfeindlichkeit in der Qumrangemeinde," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. Edited by R. Feldmeier and U. Heckel. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70. Tübingen: Mohr 59–91.
- Dillon, J. 1977. *The Middle Platonists. 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Dimant, D. 1986. "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica*. Edited by A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud. Leuven-Paris: Éditions Peeters 165–89.
- Dodd, C. H. 1953. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1963. *Historical Traditions in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dokka, T. S. 1995. "Særspråk og almenpråk. Anmerkninger til johanneisk ekklesiologi," in *Etikk og ekklesiologi*. Edited by S. A. Christoffersen. KULTs skriftserie 34. Oslo: Norges forskningsråd 73–80.
- . 1999. "Irony and Sectarianism in the Gospel of John," in *New Readings in John. Literary and Theological Perspectives*. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel, Århus 1997. Edited by J. Nissen and S. Pedersen. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement series 182. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 83–107.
- Donceel, R. and P. Donceel-Voûte. 1994. "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. New York: New York Academy of Sciences 1–38.
- Douglas, M. 1966. *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- . 1973. *Natural Symbols. Explorations in Cosmology*. (2nd edition). London: Barrie and Jenkins.
- . 1996. *Natural Symbols. Explorations in Cosmology with a New Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Dunn, J. D. G. 1991. *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity*. London/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: SCM Press/Trinity Press International.
- . (ed.) 1992. *Jews and Christians. The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 66. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1996. "Two Covenants or One? The Interdependence of Jewish and Christian Identity," in *Geschichte, Tradition, Reflexion 3: Frühes Christentum*. Edited by H. Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr 97–122.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. and M. Philonenko, (eds.) 1987. *La Bible, Écrits intertestamentaires*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Ego, B., A. Lange and P. Pilhofer (eds.) 1999. *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Elgvin, T. 1997. "Qumranfunnene, 1957–1997," in *Dødehausrullene: funn og forskning i 50 år*. Edited by R. B. Eggen and O. Hognestad. Relieff 39. Trondheim: Tapir forlag 9–23.
- Elliott, J. 1981. *A Home for the Homeless. A Sociological Exegesis of 1 Peter, Its Situation and Strategy*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.

- . 1986. "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament. More on Methods and Models," *Semeia* 35, 1–33.
- . 1993. *What Is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- . 1995. "The Jewish Messianic Movement. From Faction to Sect," in *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Edited by P. F. Esler. London: Routledge 75–95.
- . 1998. "Phases in the Social Formation of Early Christianity. From Faction to Sect. A Social-Scientific Perspective," in *Recruitment, Conquest and Conflict. Strategies in Judaism, Early Christianity and the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by P. Borgen, V. K. Robbins and D. B. Gowler. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 273–313.
- . 2001. "On Wooing Crocodiles for Fun and Profit. Confessions of an Intact Admirer," in *Social Scientific Models for Interpreting the Bible*. Edited by J. Pilch. Leiden: Brill 5–20.
- Engelstad, F., C. E. Grenness, R. Kalleberg and R. Malnes (eds.) 1996. *Samfunn og vitenskap. Samfunnsfagenes fremvekst, oppgaver og arbeidsmåter*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Epstein, I. (ed.) 1961. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Zera'im*. Volume 7 of 7 volumes. The Babylonian Talmud, translated into English with notes, glossary and indices. London: The Soncino Press.
- Esler, P. F. 1987. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1994. *The First Christians in Their Social Worlds. Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. New York: Routledge.
- . (ed.) 1995. *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. London: Routledge.
- Evans, C. A. 1989. "Jesus' Action in the Temple. Cleansing or Portent of Destruction?," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51, 237–270.
- . 1992. "Opposition to the Temple. Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday 235–53.
- Feldman, L. H. 1965. *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, Books 18–19*. Volume 9 translated by L. H. Feldman. Josephus in 10 volumes translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, M. Wikgren et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Feldmeier, R. and U. Heckel (eds.) 1994. *Die Heiden. Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Feleppa, R. 1986. "Emic, Etic, and Social Objectivity," *Current Anthropology* 27, 243–255.
- Fiorenza, E. S. 1976. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the NT," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38, 159–177.
- . 1989. "Text as Reality—Reality as Text. The Problem of Feminist Historical and Social Reconstruction Based on Texts," *Studia Theologica* 43, 19–34.
- Flanagan, J. W. 1991. "New Constructs in Social World Studies," in *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis*. Edited by D. Jobling, P. L. Day and G. T. Sheppard. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press 209–23.
- Fortna, R. T. 1970a. "Source and Redaction in the Fourth Gospel's Portrayal of Jesus' Signs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89, 151–166.
- . 1970b. *The Gospel of Signs. A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 11. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1988. *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor. From Narrative Source to Present Gospel*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.

- Fossum, J. 1996. "Social and Institutional Conditions for Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible with Special Regard to Religious Groups and Sects," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation 1. From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages. Part 1 Antiquity*. Edited by M. Sæbø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 239–55.
- Fredouille, J. C. 1986. "Heiden," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt* 13. Edited by E. Dassmann, C. Cople, A. Dihle et al. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann 1113–49.
- Frey, J. 1994. "Heiden, Griechen, Gotteskinder. Zu Gestalt und Funktion der Rede von den Heiden im 4. Evangelium," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. Edited by R. Feldmeier and U. Heckel. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70. Tübingen: Mohr 228–68.
- . 1997. *Die johanneische Eschatologie. Ihre Probleme im Spiegel der Forschung seit Reimarus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 96, 1. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Fronrobert, C. 1995. Review of Feldmeier, R. and U. Heckel *Die Heiden. Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. *Ioudaios Review* 5.015. Published October 1995.
- Früchtel, U. 1968. *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philon von Alexandrien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Frühwald-König, J. 1998. *Tempel und Kult. Ein Beitrag zur Christologie des Johannesevangeliums*. Biblische Untersuchungen 27. Regensburg: Pustet.
- Fuglseth, K. 1994. "Bibeltekst og sosiologi. Johannesevangeliet i eit sosiologisk perspektiv," in *Religionsfag-samfunnsfag*. Edited by E. Karlsæune. Relieff 35. Trondheim: Tapir forlag 59–78.
- . 2000. "Biblical Interpretation by Newton and Herder," in *Herder and Humboldt. Language and Culture*. Edited by O. Gundersen. Kulturstudier 16. Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget (Norwegian Academic Press) 55–68.
- . 2002. *A Sectarian John? A Sociological-Critical, Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Gospel of John, Philo and Qumran*. Dr. dissertation. NTNU, Trondheim: 2002.
- Gager, J. G. 1975. *Kingdom and Community*. Prentice-Hall Studies in Religion Series. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Garrett, S. R. 1992. "Sociology," in volume 6 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday 89–99.
- Gärtner, B. 1959. "John 6 and the Jewish Passover," in *Coniectanea Neotestamentica* 17. Edited by A. Riesenfeld. Lund/Copenhagen: Gleerup/Ejnar Munksgaard 1–52.
- . 1965. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaston, L. 1970. *No Stone on Another. Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Gill, R., (ed.) 1996. *Theology and Sociology. A Reader*. London: Cassell.
- Glock, C. Y. and R. Stark. 1965. *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand MacNally.
- Golb, N. 1995. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran*. New York: Scribner.
- Goldschmidt, L. 1996. *Der babylonische Talmud. Berakhoth. Misna zeraim. Sabbath*. Band 1. Nach der ersten zensurfreien Ausgabe unter Berücksichtigung der neueren Ausgaben und handschriftlichen Materials neu übertragen. Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag.
- Goldstein, J. 1981. "Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by

- E. P. Sanders, A. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press 64–87.
- Goodenough, E. R. 1933. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and his De Vita Mosis," *Harvard Theological Review* 26, 109–125.
- . 1962. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1969. *By Light, Light. The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. Amsterdam: Philo Press.
- Goodman, M. 1994. *Mission and Conversion. Proselytizing in the Religious History of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Grabbe, L. L. 1996. *An Introduction to First Century Judaism*. Jewish Religion and History in the Second Temple Period. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Guilding, A. 1960. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship. A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Haase, W. (ed.) 1984. *Religion*. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hadas-Lebel, M. 1973. *Philon. De Providentia 1 et 2*. Introduction, traduction et notes. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 35. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Haenchen, E. 1980. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Ein Kommentar aus den nachgelassenen Manuskripten herausgegeben von U. Busse. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Hägerland, T. 2003. "John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25, 3, 309–322.
- Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. 1976. "Some Techniques of Composition in Philo's Allegorical Commentary with Special Reference to DE AGRICULTURA. A Study in the Hellenistic Midrash," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians. Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity*. Edited by R. G. Hamerton-Kelly. Leiden: Brill 45–56.
- Hartman, L. 1989. "He spoke of the Temple of his Body," (Jn 2:13–22). *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 54, 70–79.
- Harvey, G. 1996. *The True Israel. Uses of the Names Jew, Hebrew and Israel in Ancient Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 35. Leiden: Brill.
- Hay, D. 1979–1980. "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," *Studia Philonica* 6, 41–75.
- . 1994. "Defining Allegory in Philo's Exegetical World," in the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1994*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 33. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 55–68.
- Heinemann, I. 1962. *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung. Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Hemminger, H. 1995. Öffentlich über Sekten sprechen. Zum kirchlichen Umgang mit dem Sektenbegriff. *Materialdienst der EZW (Evangelische Zentralstelle für Weltanschauungsfragen)* 58, 161–171. Stuttgart: Quell Verlag.
- Hempel, C. 1997. Review of P. R. Davies *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. *Dead Sea Discoveries* 4, 120–124.
- Hengel, M. 1974a. *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period 1*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM Press.
- . 1974b. *Judaism and Hellenism. Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period 2*. Translated by J. Bowden. London: SCM Press.
- . 1981. *The Atonement. A Study of the Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament*. Translated by J. Bowden. The Cross of the Son of God. London: SCM Press.
- . 1989a. *The 'Hellenization' of Judea in the First Century after Christ*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1989b. *The Johannine Question*. Translated by J. Bowden. London/ Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: SCM Press/Trinity Press International.

- . 1993. *Die johanneische Frage. Ein Lösungsversuch. (Mit einem Beitrag zur Apokalypse von J. Frey)*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 67. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1994. Einleitung. Pages IX–XVIII in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden. Mit einer Einleitung von M. Hengel*. Edited by R. Feldmeier and U. Heckel. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Holladay, W. 1988. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Oldest Hebrew. Based upon the Lexical Work of L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner*. Grand Rapids, Michigan/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill.
- Holmberg, B. 1978. *Paul and Power. The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 11. Lund: Gleerup.
- . 1990. *Sociology and the New Testament. An Appraisal*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Honigman, S. 1993. "The Birth of Diaspora. The Emergence of a Jewish Self-Definition in Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of Onomastics," in *Diasporas in Antiquity*. Edited by S. Cohen, J. D. and E. S. Frerichs. Brown Judaic Studies 288. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 1–27.
- Horbury, W. 1982. "The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy," *Journal of Theological Studies* 33, 19–61.
- Horrell, D. 1999. "Social-Scientific Interpretation to New Testament. Retrospect and Prospect," in *Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by D. Horrell. Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1–27.
- Horsley, R. A. 1994. *Sociology and the Jesus Movement*. New York: Continuum.
- Hoskyns, E. C. 1947. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edition by F. N. Davey. London: Faber and Faber.
- Howard, W. F. 1943. *Christianity According to St. John*. London: Duckworth.
- Jaffee, M. S. 1996. 'Review of L. Grabbe An Introduction to First Century Judaism. Jewish Religion and History in the Second Temple Period.' *Ioudaios Review* 6.007. Published Dec. 1996.
- Jeremias, J. 1967. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. London: SCM Press.
- Jocz, J. 1954. *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. A Study in the Controversy Between Church and Synagogue*. London: SPCK.
- Johnson, B. 1963. "On Church and Sect," *American Sociological Review* 28, 539–549.
- . 1971. "Church and Sect Revisited," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 10, 124–137.
- Johnstone, R. L. 1975. *Religion and Society in Interaction*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, W. T. 1970. *The Classical Mind. A History of Western Philosophy*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Jonge, H. J. de. 2001. "The 'Jews' in the Gospel of John," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Bieringer, R., D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Van Gorcum 121–40.
- Jonge, M. de. 1977. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God. Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective*. Edited and translated by J. E. Steely. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study 11. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 2000. "Christology, Controversy and Community in the Gospel of John," in *Christology, Controversy and Community*. Edited by D. Horrell and C. Tuckett. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 99. Leiden: Brill 209–29. *Josephus*. 1782–1785. Flavii Josephi hebraei opera omnia graece et latine I–III. Excusa ad editionem Lugduno-Batavam Sigeberti Havercampi cum Oxoniensi Ioannis Hudsonii collata. Curavit Franciscus Oberthür. Leipzig: Schwickert.

- Josephus. 1926–65. Josephus in 10 volumes. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, M. Wikgren et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Judge, E. A. 1960. *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century. Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation*. London: The Tyndale Press.
- Jull, T., D. Douglas, M. Broshi and E. Tov. 1995. "Radiocarbon Dating of Scrolls and Linen Fragments from the Judean Desert," *Radiocarbon* 37, 11–19.
- Kahn, J. G. 1963. *Philon. De confusione linguarum*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 13. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Kampen, J. 1999. "The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document," in *Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty*. Edited by R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature 15. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 185–97.
- Kampen, J. and M. Bernstein, (eds.) 1996. *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 2. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Kasher, A. 1992. "The Civic Status of the Jews in Ptolemaic Egypt," in *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*. Edited by P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle. København: Aarhus University Press 100–21.
- Käsemann, E. 1951. "Ketzer und Zeuge. Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48, 292–311.
- . 1967. *Jesu letzter Wille nach Johannes 17*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1968. *The Testament of Jesus. A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17*. Translated by G. Krodell. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- . 1969. "The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel," in *New Testament Questions of Today*. Translated from selections from Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen 2. Translated by W. J. Montague. London/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: SCM/Fortress Press 138–67.
- Kautzsch, E. and A. E. Cowley. 1966. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. As Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch*. (Revised in accordance with the 28th German edition from 1909, by A. E. Cowley. 2nd edition, corrected 1946). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kee, H. C. 1977. *Community of the New Age. Studies in Mark's Gospel*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press.
- . 1980. *Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1989. *Knowing the Truth. A Sociological Approach to New Testament Interpretation*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- . 1995. *Who are the People of God? Early Christian Models of Community*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kerr, A. 2002. *The Temple of Jesus' Body. The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 220. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kieffer, R. 1987. *Johannesevangeliet 1–10*. Kommentar till Nya Testamentet 4a. Uppsala: EFS-förlaget.
- Kimelman, R. 1981. "Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press 226–44.
- Kinzer, M. 1998. "Temple Christology in the Gospel of John," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1993*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 37. Edited by E. H. J. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 447–64.
- Klauck, H.-J. 1991. *Der erste Johannesbrief*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 1. Zürich: Benzinger Verlag.
- Klinghardt, M. 1994. "The Manual of Discipline in the Light of Statutes of Hellenistic

- Associations," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences 252–70.
- Klinzing, G. 1971. *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Knibb, M. A. 1987. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentary on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knohl, I. 1992. "Post-Biblical Sectarianism and the Priestly Schools of the Pentateuch. The Issue of Popular Participation in the Temple Cult on Festivals," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*. Edited by J. T. Barrera and L. V. Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 2. Leiden/Madrid: Brill/Editorial Complutense 601–9.
- Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner. 1958. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. A Dictionary of the Hebrew Old Testament in English and German with a Supplementum*. Leiden: Brill.
- Koester, C. R. 1995. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel. Meaning, Mystery, Community*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Korsnes, O., H. Andersen and T. Brante (eds.) 1997. *Sosiologisk leksikon*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Kraft, R. A. 1975. "The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Edited by J. Neusner. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 3. Leiden: Brill 176–99.
- Kysar, R. 1985. "The Fourth Gospel. A Report on Recent Research," in *Religion. Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Leben und Umwelt Jesu. Neues Testament (Kanonische Schriften und Apokryphen). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 25, 3. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 2389–480.
- . 1992a. "The Epistles of John," in volume 3 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday 900–12.
- . 1992b. "The Gospel of John," in volume 3 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 volumes. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday 912–31.
- . 1993. *John, the Maverick Gospel*. (Revised edition). Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- . 1996. "Coming Hermeneutical Earthquake in Johannine Interpretation," in *'What is John?' Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 185–9.
- Lamb, W. R. M. 1925. *Plato Lysis. Symposium. Gorgias*. Volume 3 translated by W. R. M. Lamb. Plato in 12 volumes. Translated by H. N. Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb, P. Shorey et al. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press.
- Langbrandter, W. 1977. *Weltferner Gott oder Gott der Liebe. Der Ketzerstreit in der johanneischen Kirche. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit Berücksichtigung der koptisch-gnostischen Texte aus Nag-Hammadi*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 6. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Larsson, E. 1987. "Die Hellenisten und die Urgemeinde," *New Testament Studies* 33:205–225.
- . 1993. Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage. Some Reflexions on Acts 6–7. *New Testament Studies* 39, 379–395.
- Leistner, R. 1974. *Antijudaismus im Johannevangelium. Darstellung des Problems in der neueren Auslegungsgeschichte und Untersuchung der Leidensgeschichte*. Theologie und Wirklichkeit 3. Bern und Frankfurt am Main: Herbert Lang.
- Lemche, N. P. 1996. "Samfundsoppfattelsen i Det Gamle Testamente og i Dødehavsteksterne," in *Dødehavsteksterne og Bibelen*. Edited by N. Hyldahl and T. L. Thompson. Forum for bibelsk eksegese 8. København: Museum Tusculanums Forlag 64–78.

- . 1998. "The Understanding of Community in the Old Testament and in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament*. Edited by Cryer, F. H. and T. L. Thompson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 290. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press 181–93.
- Léon-Dufour, X. 1951. "Le signe du temple selon saint Jean," *Recherches de sciences religieuses* 39, 155–175.
- Leroy, H. 1968. *Rätsel und Missverständnis. Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Johannes-evangeliums*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge. Bonn: Peter Hansteins Verlag.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. 1940. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Lieu, J. M. 1991. *The Theology of the Johannine Epistles*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1999. "Temple and Synagogue in John," *New Testament Studies* 45:51–69.
- Lindars, B. 1972. *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan/London: Eerdmans/Marshall, Morgan and Scott Publishers.
- Liver, J. 1963. "The Half-Shekel Offerings in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature," *Harvard Theological Review* 56, 172–188.
- Lohse, E. 1971. *Die Texte aus Qumran, Hebräisch und Deutsch. Mit Masoretischer Punctuation. Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Luckmann, T. 1992. *Theorie des sozialen Handelns*. Sammlung Götschen 2108. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Luz, U. 1996. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 8–17)*. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Band 1/2, 2. Teilband. Neukirchen, Vluyn: Benzinger Verlag/Neukirchener Verlag.
- MacDonald, M. Y. 1988. *The Pauline Churches. A Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mack, B. L. 1984. "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria," in *Religion. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 227–71.
- . 1993. *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Magness, J. 1996. "Qumran. Not a Country Villa," *Biblical Archaeology Review* 22, 37–47, 72–73.
- Malherbe, A. J. 1977. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Rockwell Lecture Series. Baton Rouge/London: Louisiana State University Press.
- . 1983. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. (2nd enlarged edition.) Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- Malina, B. J. 1981. *The New Testament World. Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Atlanta, Georgia: John Knox Press.
- . 1982. "The Social Sciences and Biblical Interpretation," *Interpretation* 36, 229–42.
- . 1985. *The Gospel of John in Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Protocol of the Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture. Berkeley: The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture.
- . 1986. "The Received View and What It Cannot Do. III John and Hospitality," *Semeia* 35, 171–194.
- . 1991. "Interpretation. Reading, Abduction, Metaphor," in *The Bible and the Politics of Exegesis*. Edited by D. Jobling, P. L. Day and G. T. Sheppard. Cleveland: Pilgrim Press 253–66.
- . 1994. "John's. The Maverick Christian Group, the Evidence of Sociolinguistics," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 24, 167–182.

- . 1995. "Early Christian Groups. Using Small Group Formation Theory to Explain Christian Organizations," in *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Edited by P. F. Esler. London: Routledge 96–113.
- . and J. H. Neyrey. 1996. *Portraits of Paul. An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- . and R. L. Rohrbaugh. 1992. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- . 1998. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Manns, F. 1995. "La fête des juifs de Jean 5, 1," *Antonianum* 70, 117–124.
- Marcus, R. 1953. *Questions and Answers on Exodus. Translated from the Ancient Armenian Version of the Original Greek*. Supplementary volume 2 translated by R. Marcus. Philo in 10 volumes and 2 supplementary volumes. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker and R. Marcus. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Marsh, J. 1968. *The Gospel of John*. Pelican Books. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. London: Penguin.
- Martínez, F. G. 1994. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English*. English edition by W. Watson. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1996. "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," in *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*. Edited by J. Kampen and M. Bernstein. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 2. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 15–27.
- . 1999. "Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 303–19.
- . and J. T. Barrera. 1995. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*. Leiden: Brill.
- . and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. 1997. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition 1, 1Q1–4Q273*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1998. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition 2, 4Q274–11Q31*. Leiden: Brill.
- . and A. S. van der Woude. 1990. "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *Revue de Qumran* 56, 521–541.
- Martinussen, W. 1984. *Sosiologisk analyse. En innføring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Martyn, J. L. 1968. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- . 1977. "Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community," in *L'Évangile de Jean. Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 44. Leuven/Gembloux: Leuven University Press/J. Duculot 148–75.
- . 1978. *The Gospel of John in Christian History. Essays for Interpreters*. Theological Inquiries. Studies in Contemporary Biblical and Theological Problems. New York: Paulist Press.
- . 1979. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. (2nd edition, revised and enlarged). Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon.
- . 1996. "A Gentile Mission That Replaced an Earlier Jewish Mission?," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*. Edited by A. R. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 124–44.
- Matill, A. J. Jr. 1977. "Johannine Communities behind the 4th Gospel," *Theological Studies* 38, 294–315.
- May, D. M. 1991. *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament. A Bibliography*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

- McCaffrey, J. 1988. *The House With Many Rooms. The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3*. Analecta Biblica 114. Rome: Editrice pontificio istituto biblico.
- McEleney, N. J. 1973. "Orthodoxy in Judaism in the First Christian Century," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 4, 19-42.
- . 1978. "Orthodoxy in Judaism in the First Christian Century," Replies to D. E. Aune and L. L. Grabbe, *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 4, 19-42.
- McKay, H. 1994. *Sabbath and Synagogue, the Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 122. Leiden: Brill.
- McKelvey, R. J. 1969. *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford Theological Monographs 3. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, A. H. 1985. "The βασιλικός in John 4:46-53," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 23, 69-72.
- Meeks, W. A. 1967. *The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 14. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1972. "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91, 44-72.
- . 1979. "'Since Then You Would Need to Go out of the World'. Group Boundaries in Pauline Christianity," in *Critical History and Biblical Faith. New Testament Perspectives*. Edited by T. J. Ryan. College Theology Society Annual Publication Series. Villanova, Pennsylvania: Villanova University 4-29.
- . 1983a. *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 1983b. Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited D. Hellholm. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1985. "Breaking Away. Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities," in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us. Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and E. Frerichs. Chico, California: Scholars Press 93-115.
- . 1986. *The Moral World of the First Christians*. Library of Early Christianity. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The Westminster Press.
- . 1996. "The Ethics of the Fourth Evangelist," in *Exploring the Gospel of John*. Edited by A. R. Culpepper and C. C. Black. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press 317-26.
- . 2003. "Assisting the Word by Making (Up) History. Luke's Project and Ours," *Interpretation* 57, 151-62.
- Mendelson, A. 1988. *Philo's Jewish Identity*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Menken, M. J. J. 1993. "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel. A Survey of Recent Research," in *From Jesus to John. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology*. Edited by M. C. de Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements Series 84. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 292-320.
- Metso, S. 1993. "The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QSc," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44, 303-08.
- . 2004. "Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found in Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 11, 315-35.
- Michaelis, W. 1964. "σκηνή κτλ." in volume 8 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Friedrich. 10 volumes. German edition by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans 368-94.
- Milik, J. T. 1951. *Manuale Disciplinae. Verbum Domini. Commentarii de re biblica* 29, 129-158.
- . 1960. Review of P. Wernberg-Møller *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated. Revue biblique* 67, 410-416.

- Moloney, F. J. 1978. *The Johannine Son of Man*. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 14. Roma: Libreria Ateneo Salesiano.
- . 1993. *Belief in the Word. Reading the Fourth Gospel. John 1–4*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- . 1996. *Signs and Shadows. Reading in John 5–12*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Moore, S. D. 1989. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels. The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Morris, L. 1995. *The Gospel According to John*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Motyer, S. 1997. *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and 'the Jews'*. Paternoster Biblical and Theological Monographs. Carlisle: Paternoster Press.
- . 2001. "The Fourth Gospel and the Salvation of Israel. An Appeal for a New Start," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Van Gorcum 83–100.
- Moxnes, H. 1983. "Kropp som symbol. Bruk av sosialantropologi i studiet av Det nye testamente," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84, 197–217.
- . 1986. "The Economy in the Gospel of Luke in Light of Social Anthropology," in *Economy in the New Testament*. Edited by H. Moxnes. Prosjektheft 2 'Urkristendommen'. Oslo: Faculty of Theology/University of Oslo 1–35.
- . 1988a. *The Economy of the Kingdom. Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke's Gospel*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- . 1988b. "Hva slags religion var urkristendommen?" *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 89, 47–66.
- . 1988c. "Sociology and the New Testament," in *Religion as a Social Phenomenon*. Edited by E. Karlsæune. Trondheim: Tapir 143–59.
- . 1993. "New Testament Ethics-Universal or Particular? Reflections on the Use of Social Anthropology in New Testament Studies," *Studia Theologica* 47, 153–68.
- . 1994a. "The Social Context of Luke's Community," *Interpretation* 48, 379–89.
- . 1994b. "Sosialantropologi i bibeltolkningen. Det Nye Testamente i lys av middehavskulturen," *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift* 70, 153–59.
- Müller, M. 1999. "Essæernes opståen som typisk tilfælde," in *Nye religioner i hellenistisk-romersk tid og i dag*. Edited by P. Bilde and M. Rothstein. Århus: Aarhus University Press 135–47.
- Mussner, F. 1965. *Die Johanneische Schweige und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*. Quaestiones disputatae 28. Freiburg: Herder.
- Neirynek, F., (ed.) 1979. "Jean et les Synoptiques. Examen critique de l'exégèse de M.-É. Boismard," in *idem* (F. Neirynek in collaboration with J. Delobel, T. Snoy, G. van Belle, F. van Segbroek). Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 49. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters 3–120.
- . 1990. "John and the Synoptics. A Response to P. Borgen," in *The Interrelations of the Gospels*. Edited by D. L. Dungan. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 95. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters 438–50.
- Nelson, G. 1968. "The Concept of Cult," *Sociological Review* 16, 351–63.
- Neusner, J. 1989. "Money-Changeers in the Temple. The Mishna's Explanation," *New Testament Studies* 35, 287–90.
- Newsom, C. A. 1990. "Sectually Explicit Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*. Edited by W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman. Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 1. Wima Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns 1–17.
- Neyrey, J. H. 1988. *An Ideology of Revolt. John's Christology in Social-Science Perspective*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.

- . (ed.) 1991. *The Social World of Luke-Acts. Models for Interpretation*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- . 1998. "The Sociology of Secrecy and the Fourth Gospel," in *'What is John?' Volume 2. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 79–109.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. and M. Stone, (eds.) 1983. *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism. Texts and Documents*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- Niebuhr, H. R. 1957. *The Social Sources of Denominationalism*. New American Library. New York: Meridian Books.
- Niebuhr, K.-W. 1999. "Tora ohne Tempel. Paulus und der Jakobusbrief im Zusammenhang frühjüdischer Torarezeption für die Diaspora," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 428–60.
- Niehoff, M. 2002. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 86. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Nielsen, E. and B. Otzen. 1959. *Dødehavsteksterne. Skrifter fra den jødiske menighed i Qumran i oversættelse og med noter*. København: Gads forlag.
- Nikiprowetzky, V. 1967a. "La spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jérusalem chez Philon d'Alexandrie," *Semitica* 17, 97–116.
- . 1967b. Temple et communauté. A propos d'un ouvrage récent [Bertil Gärtner, 'The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament', Cambridge 1965], *Revue des études juives. Historica judaica* 126, 7–25.
- . 1977. *Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie. Sa caractère et sa portée. Observations philologiques*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums 11. Leiden: Brill.
- Nissen, J. 1989. "Den sociale hermeneutik," in *Skriftsyn og metode. Om den nytestamentlige hermeneutik*. Edited by S. Pedersen. Dansk kommentar til Det nye testamente 1. Århus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag 247–88.
- NRSV. 1993. *New Revised Standard Version*. Notes and references by H. C. Kee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, J. M. 1969. "La genèse littéraire de la Règle de la communauté," *Revue biblique* 76, 528–549.
- . 1971. The Translation of Damascus Document VI,11–14," *Revue biblique* 7, 553–56.
- O'Day, G. R. 1996. "Johannine Theology as Sectarian Theology," in *'What is John?' Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Edited by G. R. O'Day. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 199–203.
- O'Dea, T. 1966. *The Sociology of Religion*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- . 1988. *The Johannine Approach to Mission. A Contextual Study of John 4:1–42*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchung zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 31. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Olsson, B. 1974. *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel. A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and 4:1–42*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 6. Lund: Gleerup.
- . 1986. "The History of the Johannine Movement," in *Aspects on the Johannine Literature*. Edited by L. Hartman and B. Olsson. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 18. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell International 27–43.
- . 1995. "A Social-Scientific Criticism of 1 Peter," in *Texts and Contexts. Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts*. Edited by T. Fornberg, D. Hellholm and C. Hellholm. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press 827–46.
- Onuki, T. 1982. "Zur literatursoziologischen Analyse des Johannesevangeliums—auf

- dem Wege zur Methodenintegration," *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute* 8, 162–216.
- . 1984. *Gemeinde und Welt im Johannesevangelium. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach der theologischen und pragmatischen Funktion des johanneischen 'Dualismus'*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 56. Neukirchen, Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Østenstad, G. 1998. *Patterns of Redemption in the Fourth Gospel*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 38. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press.
- Overman, J. A. 1990. *Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism. The Social World of the Matthean Community*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Painter, J. 1993. *The Quest for the Messiah. The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- , A. R. Culpepper and F. Segovia (eds.) 2002. *Word, Theology, and Community in John*. St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice Press.
- Pancaro, S. 1969–1970. "People of God' in St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 16, 114–29.
- , 1974–1975. "The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of John," *New Testament Studies* 21, 396–405.
- . 1975. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel. The Torah and the Gospel. Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity According to John*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 17. Leiden: Brill.
- Pelletier, A. 1962. *Aristee epistula ad Philocratem. Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes, index complet des mots grecs*. Sources chrétiennes 89. Paris: Cerf.
- Petersen, N. R. 1993. *The Gospel of John and the Sociology of Light. Language and Characterization in the Fourth Gospel*. Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International.
- Philo. 1929–1953. Philo in 10 volumes and 2 supplementary volumes. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, R. Marcus et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (some volumes also by Heinemann, London).
- Plato. 1914–1936. Plato in 12 volumes. Translated by H. N. Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb, P. Shorey et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (some volumes also by Heinemann, London).
- Pope, L. 1942. *Millhands and Preachers. A Study of Gastonia*. Yale Studies in Religious Education. New Haven/London: Yale University Press/Oxford University Press/Humphrey Milford.
- Pouilly, J. 1976. *La règle de la communauté de Qumrân. Son évolution littéraire*. Paris: J. Gabalda.
- Price, J. L. 1990. "Light from Qumran upon Some Aspects of Johannine Theology," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Christian Origins Library. (Enlarged edition of *John and Qumran*, 1972). New York: Crossroad 9–37.
- Puech, E. 1979a. "Remarques sur l'écriture de 1QS VII–VIII," *Revue de Qumran* 37, 35–43.
- . 1979b. "Review of J. Pouilly *La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân. Son évolution littéraire*," *Revue de Qumran* 37, 103–111.
- Qimron, E. 1986. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Harvard Semitic Museum. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . and J. Strugnell. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4, V. Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert (DJD) 10. With Y. Sussmann and A. Yardeni. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Quast, K. B. 1989. "Reexamining Johannine Community," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 5, 293–95.
- Quispel, G. 1972. "Qumran, John and Jewish Christianity," in *John and the Dead*

- Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Christian Origins Library. (Enlarged edition of *John and Qumran*, 1972). New York: Crossroad 137–55.
- Rahlf's, A. 1979. *Septuaginta*. (First edition 1935. Reprinted 2 volumes in 1). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Rahner, J. 1998. 'Er aber sprach vom Tempel seines Leibes'. *Jesus von Nazaret als Ort der Offenbarung Gottes im vierten Evangelium*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 117. Bodenheim: Philo.
- Rebell, W. 1989. *Gemeinde als Gegenwart. Zur soziologischen und didaktischen Funktion des Johannevangeliums*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 20. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Reinhartz, A. 1993. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and Social History. Methodological Considerations," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1993*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 32. Edited by E. H. J. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 6–21.
- . 1998. "The Johannine Community and its Jewish Neighbours: A Reappraisal," in *What is John? Volume 2. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 111–38.
- . 2001a. "'Jews' and Jews in the Fourth Gospel," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville. Jewish and Christian Heritage Series 1. Assen: Van Gorcum 213–27.
- . 2001b. *Befriending the Beloved Disciple. A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John*. New York: Continuum.
- Rensberger, D. 1988. *Johannine Faith and Liberating Community*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press.
- . 1998. "Sectarianism and Theological Interpretation in John," in *What is John? Volume 2. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 138–56.
- Reydams-Schils, G. J. 1994. "Stoicized Readings of Plato's Timaeus in Philo of Alexandria," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1994*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 33. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 450–62.
- Richardson, J. T. 1978. "An Oppositional and General Conceptualization of Cult," *Annual Review of the Social Sciences of Religion* 2, 29–52.
- Richter, G. 1977. "Zum gemeindebildenden Element in den johanneischen Schriften," in *Studien zum Johannevangelium*. Edited by J. Hainz. Biblische Untersuchungen 13. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet 383–414.
- Riesenfeld, H. 1947. *Jésus transfiguré*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 16. København: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- Ringren, H. 1995. *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. (Expanded edition). Christian Origins Library. New York: Crossroad.
- Robbins, V. K. 1996a. *Exploring the Texture of Texts. A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretations*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.
- . 1996b. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse. Rhetoric, Society, and Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Roberts, K. A. 1990. *Religion in Sociological Perspective*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- Robinson, J. A. T. 1959. "The 'Others' of John 4:38. A Test of Exegetical Method," in *Studia Evangelica 1*. Edited by K. Aland, F. L. Cross et al. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 73. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 510–5.
- . 1960. "The Destinations and Purpose of St. John's Gospel," *New Testament Studies* 6, 117–131.
- . 1962. *Twelve New Testament Studies*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1976. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM Press.

- Rohrbaugh, R. L. 1987. "‘Social Location of Thought’ as a Heuristic Construct in New Testament Study," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30, 103–19.
- . 1998. "The Gospel of John in the Twenty-First Century," in *What is John?* Volume 2. *Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F. Segovia. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 257–63.
- Roloff, J. 1970. *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus. Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1993. *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament*. Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament. Das Neue Testament Deutsch Ergänzungsreihe 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rowland, C. 1985. *Christian Origins. An Account of the Setting and Character of the Most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism*. London: SPCK.
- Runia, D. T. 1981. "Philo's *De Aeternitate mundi*," The problem of Its Interpretation. *Vigiliae Christianae* 35, 105–51.
- . 1986a. How to Read Philo. *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 40, 185–98.
- . 1986b. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. *Philosophia Antiqua*. A Series of Studies in Ancient Philosophy. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1991. "Secondary Texts in Philo's 'Quaestiones'," in *Both Literal and Allegorical. Studies in Philo of Alexandria's 'Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus'*. Edited by D. Hay. Brown Judaic Studies 232. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 47–79.
- . 1993a. *Philo in Early Christian Literature. A Survey*. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 3:3. Assen/Minneapolis, Minnesota: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press.
- , (ed.) 1993b. *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 5. Brown Judaic Studies 287. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . 1993c. "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 5. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 287. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 112–40.
- , (ed.) 1996. *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 8. Brown Judaic Studies 309. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Safrai, S. 1987. "The Temple," in *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* 2. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 1. Assen/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press 865–907.
- Saldarini, A. J. 1994. *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community*. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism. A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press.
- , (ed.) 1981–1983. *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* 1–3. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- . 1985. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press.
- . 1992. *Judaism. Practice and Belief. 63 BC–66 CE*. London/ Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: SCM Press/Trinity Press International.
- . 1993. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin.
- Sanders, J. T. 1993. *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants. The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations*. London: SCM Press.
- Sandmel, S. 1962. "Parallelomania," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81, 1–13.
- . 1971. *Philo's Place in Judaism. A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. Augmented edition. New York: Ktav Publishing House.
- . 1979. *Philo of Alexandria*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1984. "Philo Judaeus. An Introduction to the Man, his Writings, and his Significance," in *Religion. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 3–46.

- Saunders, T. J. 1975. *Plato. The Laws*. Penguin Classics. London: Penguin.
- Savinell, P. 1962. *Philon. De somniis 1–2*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 19. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Schiffman, L. H. 1981. "At the Crossroads. Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press 115–56.
- . 1983. *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. Brown Judaic Studies 33. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- . 1989. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 38. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . 1995. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls. The History of Judaism*. First printed 1994 by The Jewish Publication Society, Pennsylvania. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday.
- . 1999. "Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 267–84.
- Schlatter, A. 1975. *Der Evangelist Johannes. Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt. Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag.
- Schmidt, F. 1994. *La pensée du temple. De Jérusalem à Qumran. Identité et lien social dans le judaïsme ancien*. La Librairie du XX^e siècle. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1971a. *Das Johannesevangelium. 1. Teil, Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1–4*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. Freiburg: Herder.
- . 1971b. *Das Johannesevangelium. 2. Teil, Kommentar zu Kap. 5–12*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. Freiburg: Herder.
- . 1984. *Das Johannesevangelium. 4. Teil, Ergänzende Auslegungen und Exkurse*. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 4. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schnelle, U. 1987. *Antidoketische Christologie im Johannesevangelium. Eine Untersuchung zur Stellung des vierten Evangeliums in der johanneischen Schule*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 144. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1991. *Johanneische Ekklesiologie*. *New Testament Studies* 37, 37–50.
- . 1992. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John. An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*. Translated by L. M. Maloney. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- . 1996. "Die Tempelreinigung und die Christologie des Johannesevangeliums," *New Testament Studies* 42, 359–73.
- Scholer, J. M. 1991. *Proleptic Priests: Priesthood in the Epistle of Hebrews*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 49. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- Scholtissek, K. 1998. "Johannine Studies. A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions," *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 6, 227–59.
- Schottroff, L. 1970. *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 37. Neukirchen, Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Schrenk, G. 1965. "ἱερός κτλ," in volume 3 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Friedrich. 10 volumes. German edition by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated and edited by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans 221–83.
- Schürer, E. 1979. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D.*

- 135) 2. A new English version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black. Literary editor P. Vermes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- . 1986. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* 3a. A new English version revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black. Literary editor P. Vermes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Schwartz, D. R. 1979. "The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegum," *Revue de Qumran* 37, 83–91.
- Schweizer, E. 1959a. "The Concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John," in *New Testament Essays*. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press 230–45.
- . 1959b. "Der Kirchenbegriff im Evangelium und den Briefen des Johannes," in *Studia Evangelica Vol. 1*. Edited by K. Aland, F. L. Cross, J. Daniélou et al. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 73. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag 363–81.
- Scott, J. M. 1995. "Philo and the Restoration of Israel," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1995*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 34. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 553–75.
- Scroggs, R. 1975. "The Earliest Christian Communities as Sectarian Movement," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* 2. Edited by J. Neusner. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Leiden: Brill 1–23.
- . 1980. "The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament. The Present State of Research," *New Testament Studies* 26, 164–179.
- Segal, A. F. 1981. "Ruler of This World. Attitudes about Mediator Figures and the Importance of Sociology for Self-Definition," in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2. Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders, A. I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press 245–68.
- . 1986. *Rebecca's Children. Judaism and Christianity in the Roman World*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . 1990. *Paul the Convert. The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Segovia, F. 1981. "The Love and Hatred of Jesus and Johannine Sectarianism," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43, 258–72.
- . 1982. *Love Relationship in the Johannine Tradition. Agape/Agapan in 1 John and the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 58. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- . (ed.) 1996. *'What is John?' Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 3. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- . (ed.) 1998. *'What is John?' Volume 2. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 7. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Seland, T. 1987. "Jesus as a Faction Leader. On the Exit of the Category 'Sect,'" in *Context*. Edited by P. W. Bøckman and R. E. Kristiansen. Relieff 24. Trondheim: Tapir 197–222.
- . 1992. "Mediterranean Cultures and Studies of the New Testament World. Some Problems and Prospects in Recent Research," *Tidsskrift for kirke, religion og samfunn* 5, 75–90.
- . 1995a. "The 'Common Priesthood' of Philo and 1 Peter. A Philonic Reading of 1 Peter 2.5,9," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 57, 87–119.
- . 1995b. *Establishment Violence in Philo and Luke. A Study of Non-Conformity to the Torah and Jewish Vigilante Reactions*. Biblical Interpretation Series 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Shavit, Y. 1994. "The 'Qumran Library' in the Light of the Attitude towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*. Edited by M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: New York Academy of Sciences 299–318.

- Shroyer, M. J. 1936. "Alexandrian Jewish Literalists," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 55, 261–84.
- Siebert, F. 1999. "Die Synagoge und das Postulat eines unblutigen Opfers," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 118. Tübingen: Mohr 335–56.
- Simon, M. 1950. "Retour de Christ et reconstruction du Temple dans la pensée chrétienne primitive," in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne*. [No editor noted]. Bibliothèque Théologique. Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé 247–57.
- Singer, S. 1992. *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the Commonwealth*. Enlarged edition. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Skarsten, R. 1987. *Forfatterproblemet ved De Aeternitate Mundi i Corpus Philonicum*. Dissertation presented at the University of Bergen.
- Smallwood, E. M. 1970. *Philonis Alexandrini. Legatio ad Gaium*. Translation. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, D. Moody. 1974–1975. "Johannine Christianity. Some Reflections on Its Character and Delineation," *New Testament Studies* 21, 222–48.
- . 1995. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2000. "When Did the Gospels Become Scripture?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119, 3–20.
- Social Compass*. 1992, 39. International Review of Sociology of Religion. *The Sociology of Christianity's Beginnings*. London: Sage.
- Stanton, G. N. 1985. "Presuppositions in New Testament Criticism," in *New Testament Interpretation. Essays on Principles and Methods*. Edited by I. H. Marshall. Carlisle: The Paternoster Press 60–71.
- . 1994. "Revisiting Matthew's Communities," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1994*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 33. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 9–23.
- Stark, R. 1986a. "The Class Basis of Early Christianity. Inferences from a Sociological Model," *Sociological Analysis* 47, 216–25.
- . 1986b. "Jewish Conversion and the Rise of Christianity," in *SBL 1986 Seminar Papers*. Edited by K. H. Richards. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 25. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 314–29.
- Stark, R. and W. S. Bainbridge. 1985. *The Future of Religion. Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkeley: University of Californian Press.
- . 1987. *A Theory of Religion*. Toronto Studies in Religion. New York: Peter Land.
- Stark, W. 1967. *The Sociology of Religion. A Study of Christendom*. Sectarian Religion 2. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Starobinski-Safran, E. 1970. *Philon. De fuga et inventione*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 17. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Stegemann, H. 1971. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität.
- . 1992a. "The Institutions of Israel in the Temple Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10. Leiden: Brill 156–86.
- . 1992b. "The Qumran Essenes—Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress 1*. Edited by J. T. Barrera and L. V. Montaner. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 11:1. Leiden/Madrid: Brill/Editorial Complutense 83–166.
- . 1994. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch*. Freiburg: Herder.

- Stendahl, K., (ed.) 1957. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York: Harper.
- Sterling, G. E. 1993. "Platonizing Moses. Philo and Middle Platonism," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 5. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 287. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 96–111.
- . 1995a. "Recluse or Representative? Philo and Greek-Speaking Judaism Beyond Alexandria," in *SBL 1995 Seminar Papers*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 34. Edited by E. Lovering. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 595–616.
- . 1995b. "'Thus are Israel'. Jewish Self-Definition in Alexandria," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 7. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 305. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 1–18.
- . 1997. "The Bond of Humanity. Friendship in Philo of Alexandria,," in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald. Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 203–333.
- . 1998a. "Review of E. Birnbaum *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought. Israel, Jews and Proselytes*," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 10. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 319. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 191–94.
- . 1998b. "Review of P. Borgen *Philo of Alexandria. An Exegete for His Time*," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 10. Edited D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 319. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 183–88.
- Steudel, A. 1994. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat A.B). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegum') und 4Q177 ('Catena A') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Stibbe, M. W. G. 1992. *John as Storyteller. Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stone, M. 1981. "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple. Theology, Perception and Conversion," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 12, 195–204.
- Stowers, S. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans. Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Strack, H. 1915. *Berakhoth. Der Misnatraktat 'Lobsagungen'*. Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin 44. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.
- . and P. Billerbeck. 1965. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 1–6. 4. unveränderte Auflage (1. Auflage 1926)*. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Strugnell, J. 1994. MMT. "Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press 57–73.
- Svartvik, J. 1998. "Ersättningsteologins historiska bakgrund," *Nordisk Judaistik (Scandinavian Jewish Studies)* 19, 89–108.
- Sweeney, M. A. (ed.) 1999. *Review of Biblical Literature* 1. Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Talmon, S. 1985. "Jüdische Sektenbildung in der Frühzeit der Periode des Zweiten Tempels. Ein Nachtrag zu Max Webers Studie über das antike Judentum," in *Max Webers Sicht des antiken Christentums—Interpretation und Kritik*. Edited by W. Schlachter. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 233–80.
- . 1986. "The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period," in *King, Cult and Calendar in Ancient Israel*. Edited by S. Talmon. Leiden/Jerusalem: Brill/The Magnes Press 165–201.
- . 1994. "The Community of the Renewed Covenant. Between Judaism and Christianity," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium*

- on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press 3–24.
- Taylor, N. H. 1995. "The Social Nature of Conversion in the Early Christian World," in *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context*. Edited by P. F. Esler. London: Routledge 128–36.
- Tcherikover, V. A. and A. Fuks. 1957. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 1. Cambridge: The Magnes Press (The Hebrew University)/Harvard University Press.
- . and A. Fuks. 1960. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 2. Cambridge: The Magnes Press (The Hebrew University)/Harvard University Press.
- Terian, A. 1992. *Philon. Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum, 1 et 2, e versione armenica et fragmenta graeca*. Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 34c. Philo translated by R. Arnaldez, J. Cazeaux, S. Daniel et al. Paris: Cerf.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. 1926. *Josephus. The Life. Against Apion*. Volume 1 translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Josephus in 10 volumes translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, M. Wikgren et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- . 1930. *Josephus. Jewish Antiquities, Books 1–4*. Volume 4 translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Josephus in 10 volumes translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, R. Marcus, M. Wikgren et al. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Theissen, G. 1976. "Tempelweissagung Jesu. Prophetie im Spannungsfeld von Stadt und Land," *Theologische Zeitung* 32, 144–58.
- . 1977. *Soziologie der Jesusbewegung. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*. Theologische Existenz heute 194. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- . 1988a. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*. Translated by J. Bowden. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- . 1988b. *Soziologie der Jesusbewegung. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*. Kaiser Taschenbücher 35. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag.
- . 1999. *The Religion of The Earliest Churches. Creating a Symbolic World*. Translated by J. Bowden. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Thelander, M. 1974. *Grepp och begrepp i språksociologin*. Ord och stil. Språkvårdssamfundets skrifter 6. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Thyen, H. 1977. "Entwicklungen innerhalb der johanneischen Theologie und Kirche im Spiegel von Joh 21 und der Lieblingsjüngertexte des Evangeliums," in *L'Évangile de Jean. Sources, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by M. de Jonge. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicalarum Lovaniensium 44. Leuven/Gembloux: Leuven University Press/J. Duculot 259–99.
- . 1980. "Das Heil kommt von den Juden," in *Kirche*. Edited by D. Lührmann and G. Strecker. Tübingen: Mohr 163–84.
- . 1988. "Johannesevangelium," in volume 17 of *Theologische Realenzyklopädie*. Edited by G. Krause and G. Müller. Berlin: de Gruyter 200–25.
- Tidball, D. 1983. *An Introduction to the Sociology of the New Testament*. Exeter: Paternoster.
- Tov, E., (ed.) 1993. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts From the Judean Desert*. Leiden: Brill.
- Trocme, E. 1968–69. "L'expulsion des marchands du temple," *New Testament Studies* 15, 1–22.
- Troeltsch, E. 1981. *The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches*. With an introduction by H. R. Niebuhr. Translated by O. Wyon (German original 1911). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Tronier, H. 1996. "Hellenistic Hermeneutics and Paul's Idea of the Spirit in First Corinthians," in *The New Testament in its Hellenistic Context*. Edited by G. Jónsson. Studia theologica islandica 10. Reykjavik: Guðfræðistofnun Háskóla Íslands 37–55.
- Ulfsgard, H. 1989. *Feast and Future. Revelation 7:9–17 and the Feast of Tabernacles*.

- Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 22. Lund: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Ulrichsen, J. 2003. "Jesus-der neue Tempel? Ein kritischer Blick auf die Auslegung von Joh 2, 13–22," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica*. Edited by D. Aune, T. Seland and J. Ulrichsen. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 106. Leiden: Brill 202–14.
- Umemoto, N. 1994. "Juden, 'Heiden' und das Menschengeschlecht in der Sicht Philons von Alexandria," in *Die Heiden: Juden, Christen und das Problem des Fremden*. Edited by R. Feldmeier and U. Heckel. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 70. Tübingen: Mohr 22–51.
- VanderKam, J. 1994. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- . 1998. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge.
- Vermes, G. 1975. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. (2nd edition). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- . 1995. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. (4th edition). London: Penguin.
- . and M. Goodman. 1989. *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament (JSOT) Press.
- Vos, C. S. de. 1999. *Church and Community Conflicts. The Relationship of the Thessalonian, Corinthian, and Philippian Churches with Their Wider Civic Communities*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 168. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Vouga, F. 1977. *Le cadre historique et l'intention théologique de Jean*. Beauchesne Religions. Paris: Editions Beauchesne.
- Wahlde, U. C. von. 1982. "The Johannine 'Jews' A Critical Survey," *New Testament Studies* 43, 385–408.
- . 1995. "Community in Conflict. The History and Social Context of the Johannine Community," *Interpretation* 44, 379–89.
- Wallis, R. 1975. "The Cult and Its Transformation," in *Sectarianism. Analyses of Religious and Non-Religious Sects*. Edited by R. Wallis. Contemporary Issues Series. London: Peter Owen 35–49.
- . and S. Bruce. 1984. "The Stark-Bainbridge Theory of Religion. A Critical Analysis and Counter Proposals," *Sociological Analysis* 45, 11–28.
- . 1986. *Sociological Theory, Religion and Collective Action*. Belfast: The Queen's University of Belfast.
- Walter, N. 1964. *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchung zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen 86. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Watson, F. 1986. *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles. A Sociological Approach*. Society for New Testament Studies Monographs Series 56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1993. "Introduction: The Open Text," in *The Open Text. New Directions for Biblical Studies?* Edited by F. Watson. London: SCM Press 1–12.
- Weber, K. 1994. Is There a Qumran Parallel to Matthew 24,51 // Luke 12,46? *Revue de Qumran* 60, 657–63.
- Weber, M. 1993. *The Sociology of Religion*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wegner, U. 1985. "Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum. (Mt 7,28a; 8,5–10,13 par Lk 7, 1–10)," *Ein Beitrag zur Q-forschung*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 14. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Weinfeld, M. 1986. *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. Novum Testamentum et orbis antiquus 2. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Freiburg/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wengst, K. 1981. *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus. Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation*. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 5. Neukirchen, Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

- Wenschkewitz, H. 1932. *Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe. Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament*. Leipzig: Pfeiffer.
- Wentling, J. L. 1989. "Unravelling the Relationship Between 11QT, the Eschatological Temple, and the Qumran Community," *Revue de Qumran* 53, 61–73.
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 1957. *The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1. Leiden: Brill.
- White, M. 1988. "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity," *Bulletin of the John Ryland's University Library of Manchester* 70, 7–24.
- Williamson, R. 1970. *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums 4. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1989. *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Philo*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200. Leiden: Brill.
- Wilson, B. 1969. "A Typology of Sects," in *Sociology of Religion*. Edited by R. Robertson. Baltimore: Penguin 361–83.
- . 1973. *Magic and the Millennium. A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. London: Heinemann.
- . 1990. *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism. Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*. London: Clarendon Press.
- Winston, D. 1984. "Philo's Ethical Theory," in *Religion. (Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus). Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Part 2, Principat. 21, 1. Edited by W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter 372–416.
- . 1999. "Philo of Alexandria," in volume 2 of *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. 2 Volumes. Edited by J. H. Hayes. Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon Press 283–86.
- , and J. Dillon. 1983. *Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria. A Commentary on De gigantibus and Quod Deus sit immutabilis*. Brown University Judaic Studies 25. Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- Wise, M. O. 1991. "4Q Florilegium and the Temple of Adam," *Revue de Qumran* 15, 103–32.
- , Abegg Jr. and E. Cook. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Wolfson, H. A. 1962. *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. 3. revised printing. Structure and Growth of Philosophic Systems from Plato to Spinoza 1. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Yee, G. A. 1989. *Jewish Feasts in John's Gospel*. Zacchaeus Studies: New Testament. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.
- Yinger, M. J. 1970. *The Scientific Study of Religion*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Young, F. 1993. "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading," in *The Open Text. New Directions for Biblical Studies?* Edited by F. Watson. London: SCM Press 103–20.
- Yonge, C. D. 1993. *The Works of Philo. Complete and Unabridged*. New Updated Version. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Zeller, D. 1995. "The Life and Death of the Soul in Philo of Alexandria. The Use and Origin of a Metaphor," in *The Studia Philonica Annual. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 7. Edited by D. T. Runia. Brown Judaic Studies 305. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press 19–55.

GENERAL INDEX

- a-historical 36, 42, 62
- abduction 42, 83
- Abraham 99, 103, 293, 303, 324, 326, 328, 329
- abrogation (of the temple, prescription, the Law), abrogator (Jesus) 100, 122, 154, 157, 161, 166, 167, 168, 173, 178, 195, 216, 219, 227, 234, 252, 257, 258, 266, 269, 270, 277, 278, 282, 283, 295, 335
- acceptance model (temple relationship generally) 175–176, 185, 246, 281
- accommodate(d), accommodating 49, 58, 62, 64, 192, 329, 347, 351, 369–374
- addressee(s) 1, 31, 71, 84, 85, 87, 110, 111, 182, 296, 307, 310, 311, 313, 318, 350
- aetiology (of the Johannine group) 34
- Alexandria, Alexandrian (Egypt) 1, 30, 59, 64, 86–105, 115, 116, 188, 190, 192, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 203, 205, 217, 232, 240, 241, 245, 248, 262, 321, 322, 323, 324, 326, 327, 328, 330, 333, 334, 335, 363, 364, 365, 372
- Alexandrian Jews, Jewry, Judaism 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 105, 190, 192, 194, 195, 199, 200, 217, 240, 245, 248, 321, 322, 324, 328, 334, 357, 363, 364
- alienation, alienate 70, 288
- Allegorical Commentary (Philo) 87, 213
- allegorist(s) 92–104, 219, 245, 321, 322, 363
- allegory, allegorical (interpretation/method), allegorised, allegorising 34, 35, 36, 37, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 116, 126, 127, 192, 193, 194, 200, 203, 204, 205, 206, 211, 213, 214, 215, 217, 335, 364
- altar 207, 216, 226, 227, 229, 230, 231, 276
- ambiguity, ambivalence 7, 8, 51, 92, 131, 142, 145, 165, 175, 192, 216–219, 222, 234, 235, 238, 239, 240, 244, 245, 312, 350, 369, 371, 372
- anachronism, anachronistic 24, 39, 46, 55, 78, 79, 83, 114, 308
- ancestral tradition(s), faith, custom 95, 96, 98, 104, 188, 190, 192, 193, 195, 196, 205, 267, 269, 325, 331, 332, 363
- Angel of Darkness 342
- angels 221, 223, 329
- animal worship 201, 326, 327, 328, 335
- antagonism (cultic and sectarian) 58, 63, 64, 122, 185, 241, 351
- anti-establishment, criticism of the establishment 7, 25, 50, 63, 358
- anti-language, anti-society/social 4, 23, 24, 323
- anti-Semitism, anti-Jewish, anti-Judaism 8, 76, 291
- anti-temple 135, 175, 282
- Antiochus Epiphanes 280, 281
- Antipas (Herod) 298
- apocalyptic 3, 289
- apocalyptic escapism 289
- apocryphic, apocrypha, apocryphal 128, 220, 349
- apologetics 33, 142, 329
- apostasy, apostate(s) 81, 94, 96, 98, 363, 364
- Arabs 323, 330
- Aramaic 313
- archaeology, archaeological 106, 112, 113, 145, 224, 251
- Aristobulus 88
- Aristotle-(like) 103
- Armenian 207, 215
- Ascalon 195
- association(s) 1, 109, 205, 221, 279, 337, 338
- atheism, atheist 96, 323, 326
- Athens 133, 188, 329
- atonement, atoning 8, 121, 131, 143, 171, 194, 233, 237, 272, 343
- audience cult 57
- authority(ies) (new) 58, 64, 367

- Babel 96–98
 Babylon, Jewish exile in 190
 Baha'i 53
 ban, herem, Birkat ha-Minim 75–78, 309
 banquets 262, 324
 baptism 4, 80, 129, 144, 365
 Bar Kokhba revolt 120
 Barbarians 324, 329, 330
 basilikos, (royal official, nobleman) 296–302, 306, 317, 318
 Belial (the Evil) 226, 339
 belief 11, 16, 25, 29, 34, 50, 53, 56, 63, 64, 105, 141, 165, 185, 188, 190, 191, 193, 212, 272, 277, 282, 284, 295, 296, 300, 316, 321, 330, 353, 366, 368, 369, 372
 Beloved Disciple 64, 71, 73, 223, 366
 Beso (Jerusalem) 112
 bet (house) 52, 121
 Bethel 124, 128, 171, 213
 Bethzatha 124
 biblical Hebrew (language) 105, 106, 155, 158, 168, 213, 224, 236, 238, 273, 280, 313, 377
 birth, new birth (from above) 141, 147, 230, 311, 360
 blasphemy 209, 280, 340
 blood (bloodless) 216, 227, 230, 265, 268, 271, 272, 297, 347
 body (metaphor, symbol) 101, 102, 104, 126, 128, 133, 136, 137, 138, 139, 152, 153, 159, 160–179, 184, 185, 206, 207, 209, 217, 218, 234, 241, 242, 243, 244, 246, 254, 260, 264, 269, 282, 326
 body-and-soul (metaphor) 101, 102, 206
 Book of Esther 255
 Book of signs (Jn) 124, 147, 152, 253, 280
 boundary(ies) 15, 16, 19, 58, 64, 68, 111, 147, 285, 286, 296, 300, 310, 317, 344, 353, 364
 branch (es), κλήματα 68, 81, 135
 bread (true bread, bread from heaven) 259, 261, 265–268, 270, 282, 303
 brothers (ἀδελφοί) 80, 84, 85, 275
 Caiaphas (prophecy) 74, 296, 309, 310, 311, 312, 314
 Cairo 75, 108
 calendar 140, 222, 223, 231, 247, 362
 Cana 147, 153, 154, 165, 170, 178, 289, 299, 323
 Canaan, Canaanite 289, 323
 Capernaum 153, 261, 298, 299
 Carbon 14 analysis 108, 224
 case-debate structure 151, 152, 161, 163, 164, 256, 257
 catechesis 18, 130
 CD-B, reconstructed (Qumran) 220
 Chaldaeans 323, 326, 328
 charismatic leader(s)/sects, charisma 18, 54, 58, 64, 365, 367, 372
 child-sacrifice 329
 Chirbet Qumran 106
 Christology, christological (claims, solution, debate, etc., High Christology) 4, 8, 19, 22, 32, 34, 79, 81, 121, 128, 130, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 148, 158, 167, 169–174, 223, 243, 256, 260, 274, 276, 280, 312, 317, 353, 366, 373
 Church of England 52
 circular argument 7, 19, 22, 26, 49, 168, 255, 360, 361
 circumcision 101, 133, 188, 194, 234, 275, 289, 327
 city (metaphor) 213–215
 Claudius' edict (letter, rescript) on the Alexandrian situation 88–89, 90, 104, 334
 client cult 57
 coalition(s) 24, 49, 50
 collective (terms etc.) 72, 80, 84, 85, 111, 114, 131, 221, 287, 339
 colonies (Diaspora as) 196–198
 community council (Qumran) 233, 234, 340
 comparative approach, studies, method 3, 9, 28, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38, 56, 84, 103, 160, 187, 194, 238, 341, 345
 compensation theory (exchange, utilitarian theory) 61–62, 229
 composition, compositional 5, 33, 35, 124, 133, 144, 147, 151, 152, 155, 163, 261, 279, 291
 conflict model 15
 congregation 1, 84, 108, 110, 132, 207, 217, 222, 233, 241, 243, 244, 254, 338, 342
 conjunction model (temple relationship generally) 175–176, 185, 246, 247, 248, 249, 281, 282, 283, 284, 318, 367

- consecrate, consecration 166, 280, 282
 continuity 58, 59, 60, 131, 287, 319, 370
 contra-culture 52
 conventicle, Konventikel (ecclesiola) 1, 18, 20, 51, 52
 Corinth 75, 131
 Cornelius (Acts) 305
 cosmology, cosmological 190, 191, 205
 cosmos, the world, universe (as temple) 19, 81, 176, 190, 191, 196, 201, 202, 208, 209, 210–212, 213, 215, 217, 244, 266, 272, 275, 287–289, 290, 293, 305, 312, 353, 355
 covenant, covenantal 25, 51, 118, 133, 138, 177, 227, 229, 230, 266, 339, 341, 342, 343, 347
 Creator 212, 326, 330, 335
 Cretan(s) 313
 cross-cultural 26, 40, 47, 49, 60, 62
 crucifixion, crucified 147, 163, 166, 264, 270, 272, 312
 Crypto-Christians 20, 268
 cult (see sect and cult) 26, 51–65, 57, 60, 143, 353, 360–378
 cultus (not cult) 52, 117, 119, 120, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 134, 140, 153, 155, 156, 159, 163, 166, 171, 177, 181, 191, 193, 197, 198, 200, 203, 212, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 226, 227, 228, 239, 247, 253, 306, 310, 318, 330, 361, 362, 365
 Damascus Community 110
 Damascus Document (CD) 10, 108, 110, 111, 221, 339, 347
 darkness 19, 111, 124, 223, 277, 288, 297, 341, 342, 343, 344
 defile, defilement 130, 142, 143, 220, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 232, 239, 247, 248, 315, 362
 delegation, Alexandrian Jewish
 delegation to Rome 88, 197, 218
 denomination(s) 47, 53, 54, 57, 194
 desert 224, 228, 255, 275
 deviance, deviant group 13, 15, 25, 45, 55, 56, 231, 284, 356, 361, 362, 363, 364, 370, 373
 Devil 137, 314
 diachronic (analysis) 139, 146, 207, 260
 dialectic method (allegory) 203, 204
 Diaspora 60, 76, 89, 92, 97, 132, 133, 189, 191, 193, 194, 195, 197, 198, 199, 200, 217, 219, 222, 240, 243, 304, 306, 310, 312, 318, 363, 364
 dieresis (allegory) 203, 204
 dietary laws 323
 difference (cultic and sectarian, see antagonism and separation) 58, 63, 64, 122, 241
 Diotrophes 85
 discriminatory power 25, 356, 359, 366
 dispersed children of God 310–314, 317, 318
 DNA-analysis (Qumran) 108
 Docetism, docetic (sources) 18, 21, 286, 353
 double entendre, meaning (symbolic language) 163, 164, 223, 303
 dream(s) 213–214
 drink (true) 265
 driven out of the congregation (aposynagogos) 17, 33, 35, 75, 76–79, 83, 367
 dualism, dual world 9, 10, 18, 19, 23, 101, 102, 179, 204, 205, 209, 220, 223, 247, 277, 286, 288, 341, 343, 351, 353, 367
 dyadic (group-orientation) 67, 114
 early church 5, 12, 14, 25, 26, 50, 51, 53, 60, 63, 64, 121, 128, 129, 130, 132, 143, 158, 171, 174, 188, 241, 358, 359, 361, 365
 ecclesia 56, 57, 63, 68, 85, 86
 ecclesiology, ecclesiological (teaching) 4, 6, 7, 67, 70, 80, 81, 82, 83, 109, 114, 148, 254
 education 88, 89, 190, 322, 328
 Egypt, Egyptian(s) 45, 86, 87, 88, 92, 102, 190, 194, 196, 201, 207, 241, 263, 322, 323, 325–328, 329, 334, 335, 338, 351
 Eighteen Benedictions 75, 119
 ἐκκλησία 4, 52, 68, 85, 86
 Elder John (presbyter) 73, 85, 115
 Elephantine 117, 118
 elitist, elitism 89, 90, 343, 355
 emancipation (Christianity and Judaism) 141, 166
 emic 25, 42, 52
 enigma, enigmatic 5, 17, 82, 105, 150, 153, 162, 303
 Enlightenment 142

- Ephesus 75
 epistemology 103, 204, 212, 217
 eschatology, eschatological (hope etc.),
 non-eschatological understanding
 18, 19, 130, 131, 133, 134, 138,
 146, 158, 163, 171, 172, 173, 177,
 180, 182, 196, 220, 223, 225, 235,
 312, 332, 339
 esoterism, esoteric (group) 2, 17, 90,
 114, 223, 351
 Essene(s) 9, 11, 12, 46, 105–113,
 129, 159, 187, 219, 220, 221, 222,
 223, 224, 230, 231, 330, 337, 338,
 344, 347, 350, 361, 377
 Ethiopian eunuch (Acts) 305
 ethnic status, problems, groups (ethnos)
 88, 289, 305, 317, 321
 etic 25, 42
 Euphrates 323
 Europe, European 7, 47, 333
 exclusion 50, 63, 77, 115, 316, 340,
 348, 358
 exclusive, exclusiveness 2, 7, 10, 11,
 16, 17, 20, 21, 24, 30, 46, 47, 52,
 53, 76, 109, 139, 192, 236, 252,
 288, 319, 325, 332, 335, 339, 341,
 344, 346, 349, 353, 354, 357, 358,
 367, 370, 372, 374
 exegetical levels of understanding
 (Philo) 205
 Exodus (event) 260, 266
 external relationships 29, 287, 288,
 321–325, 341–349, 350, 355
 eye of God 331

 faction(s) 23, 24, 26, 49, 50, 51, 63,
 139, 366
 falsification 40, 220
 Farewell Discourse 2, 23, 68, 70
 Father 124, 139, 158, 167, 177, 178,
 183, 184, 242, 256, 265, 266, 267,
 268, 275, 280, 289, 295, 333, 346
 fats of sacrifice 236, 237
 Festival of Booths (Tabernacles) 123,
 125, 127, 137, 140, 156, 243, 251,
 252, 253, 254, 255, 272, 273–278,
 279, 282, 302, 306
 Festival of Dedication 123, 125, 137,
 243, 251, 252, 274, 278, 279, 280,
 281, 282
 Festival of Ingathering 273
 festival of light (Dedication) 279
 first man and woman 162, 178, 206,
 207, 242

 flesh 180, 216, 223, 236, 237, 263,
 264, 265, 268, 303, 343
 fold and flock 80, 81, 307, 309
 food (true food) 265, 303, 349
 foreigners 328, 336, 346, 348, 349,
 362
 form criticism 3, 6, 37
 formula of allegory (A:B=C:B → A=C)
 204, 214
 friend, friendship, friendly attitude 21,
 158, 211, 230, 285, 288, 314, 322,
 328, 351, 372, 375
 fulfil (the scripture, Jesus) 269
 functionalism, functional 16, 62, 104,
 191, 211, 212
 future temple 232

 Gaius Caligula 88, 193, 197, 199,
 218, 315, 326, 330, 334
 Galatian group (Paul) 71
 Galilee, Galilean 120, 252, 291, 293,
 299
 Gamaliel II 75
 gate of the Essenes (Jerusalem) 112
 gate-theme 307
 gemara 75
 Gentile temple(s), cultus 200, 203,
 219, 227, 305
 Gentile(s), Gentile Christians, Gentile
 Greek 60, 94, 135, 137, 146, 154,
 159, 200, 201, 203, 219, 227, 230,
 254, 289, 292, 296, 297, 298, 299,
 301, 302–306, 308, 309, 310, 311,
 312, 313, 317, 318, 322, 323, 324,
 325, 326, 332, 335, 336, 345, 346,
 347, 348, 350, 356, 362
 Gerizim 118, 123, 125, 126, 140,
 177, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 282,
 290, 292, 294, 295, 317
 glory of God 124, 166, 167, 168,
 169, 258
 Gnosticism, gnostic motifs/sources 5,
 17, 18, 21, 22, 27, 146, 289, 353
 go down καταβαίνω 17, 102, 265
 go up ἀναβαίνω 17, 102, 304
 God-fearing 305
 Gospel of John *passim*
 Greece 323, 330
 Greek philosophy, philosophers 206,
 210, 216, 217, 322, 331
 Groningen hypothesis (Qumran) 106,
 230
 group and grid 13, 23, 139
 guild (Qumran) 109, 337

- gymnasium (in Alexandria) 89, 90
gymnosophists (India) 330
- Hagar 326
halachah, halak(h)ic 86, 108, 221,
222, 230, 231, 256, 346, 362
half-shekel 199, 232
Halliday, M. A. K. 23, 24
Harnack, Adolf von 5, 71
harvesting 176, 179, 201, 255, 273
Hasmonean(s) 226
hate, hatred 288, 289, 340, 353, 367,
369, 374
Helicon 94
Hellenism, Hellenistic 29, 30, 97, 98,
99, 101, 132, 133, 174, 182, 191,
193, 204, 205, 212, 217, 242, 262,
302, 328, 337, 338, 348
Hellenistic Judaism (Jewish ideas),
Hellenistic Jews, Hellenist(s),
hellenised 132, 133, 191, 262,
302–306, 312, 337, 348
Herder, J. G. 5
hermeneutic understanding and theory
6, 7, 8, 9, 27, 32, 35, 114, 206,
217, 371
Herod, Herodian (king, temple) 157,
167, 195, 200, 298
heroes 329
heuristic method, device 39, 40, 42,
53, 56, 58, 62–65
Hieropolis (Jerusalem) 196
High Christology 19, 137, 138, 139
High Priest 80, 104, 134, 208, 213,
215, 216, 280, 315
historical (critical) approach, historical
criticism 6, 24, 27, 31, 32, 36, 37,
42, 55, 137, 364
historical Jesus 32, 70, 74, 78, 80,
121, 125, 128, 135, 142, 145, 146,
147, 157, 163, 171, 172, 181, 188,
220, 368
history and theology 32, 74
history of religion (Religionsgeschichte)
30, 31
Holy Spirit (see also Paraclete) 3, 74,
82, 83, 180, 209, 281, 372
Homer 97
hostile, hostility 2, 14, 17, 26, 79,
121, 185, 289, 317, 348, 351, 362
Husserl, E., Husserlian phenomenology
16
huts (sukkot) 273
hymn, the ultimate 202
hymns of praise (sacrifice) 90, 201,
202, 203, 348, 365
identity 15, 16, 18, 24, 32, 60, 67,
192, 297, 299, 302, 304, 305, 345,
359
ideology of revolt 139
ideology, ideological 2, 15, 25, 33,
49, 50, 54, 62, 118, 122, 137, 139,
180, 181, 183, 184, 223, 345, 351,
356, 358, 366, 367
idiosyncracies 90, 353, 366
idolatry, idols 183, 216, 226
Ignatius 46
implied author, implied reader 299,
314
in-group 286
inclusive, inclusiveness 47, 109, 236,
290, 319, 335, 342, 347, 349, 356,
358, 369, 370, 372, 373, 374
incommensurability 40
Indians 323, 329
indigenous tradition 55, 59, 60, 360,
361, 362, 363, 364, 371
innovation 52, 57, 58, 60, 64, 143,
175, 231, 247, 268, 274, 353, 359,
362–374
insiders 17, 286, 343, 344, 350
Inspector (Qumran) 340, 342
institutional approach (to the temple
etc.), institutionalisation 40, 47, 60,
98, 121, 156, 172, 247, 256, 257,
365, 372, 373
insulation 50, 289, 350
intra-mural 316, 322
introversionist (sects) 10, 12, 48, 50,
51, 62, 63, 358, 359
Ioudaios (Judaeans, Jew) 19, 75, 76,
79, 80, 138, 147, 149, 153, 155,
156, 181, 196, 207, 254, 261, 273,
275, 290, 291, 293, 295, 309, 312,
313, 314, 316, 327, 347
Irenaeus 73, 120
irony, ironic 296, 311
irreligion 160, 178
Isaac 104, 329
isolated 3, 11, 21, 24, 72, 78, 86, 87,
89, 90, 91, 118, 153, 183, 184, 221,
223, 228, 231, 239, 285, 333, 339,
350, 353, 361, 362, 371
isolation 18, 19, 27, 56, 64, 111,
122, 125, 151, 185, 215, 223, 228,
240, 248, 289, 316, 347, 351, 354,
357, 363, 371, 374

- Israel, Israelite 14, 32, 50, 60, 87,
 110, 111, 112, 121, 136, 137, 138,
 139, 168, 171, 178, 192, 196, 207,
 221, 225, 226, 227, 233, 234, 236,
 241, 255, 257, 263, 276, 287, 289,
 290, 297, 307, 308, 310, 319, 322,
 324, 331–334, 335, 339, 342, 343,
 345, 347, 359, 365
- Jacob 104, 171, 180, 181, 213, 293
 James 136, 193
 Jamnia 75, 77
 Jerome 120
 Jerusalem (see temple of Jerusalem)
 Jesus movement 13, 14, 16, 36, 37,
 49, 50, 51, 63, 139, 285, 289, 366,
 368
 Jesus' ministry 32, 79, 83, 123, 124,
 125, 147, 252, 254, 264, 270
 Jewish institution(s) 97, 100, 101, 117,
 138, 154, 172, 259, 283, 286, 316
 Jewish movement(s) 11, 92–93, 222
 Jewish-Christians, Jewish Christianity
 8, 9, 12, 15, 17, 20, 22, 29, 59, 75,
 77, 78, 87, 119, 120, 129, 132, 135,
 137, 175, 206, 260, 283, 314
 Jewish-Samaritan relation, barriers
 118, 180, 292, 293
 Johannine circle 4, 20, 68
 Johannine community (the question of
 its existence) 67–116
 Johannine question, enigma, problem
 (die johanneische Frage) 5, 6, 34,
 63
 John Hyrcanos 118
 John the Baptist 20, 72, 129, 143,
 159, 275, 281
 Jonathan (Qumran, the wicked priest)
 106, 228
 Jordan 275, 322
 Joseph 213
 Josephus 9, 45, 88, 93, 105, 112,
 118, 135, 155, 197, 199, 210, 215,
 221, 230, 251, 273, 279, 293, 297,
 298, 299, 302, 325, 347, 348, 354,
 359, 377
 Judaea, Judaeans 11, 196, 224, 262,
 291, 298
 Judaeans desert 224
 Judaism *passim*
 Julian Apostata 120
 jurisdiction (of the temple authorities)
 93, 193, 200
 Justin 46
- Kairos 130
 Karaites 87
 key of interpretation, interpretive key
 17, 165, 263
 koinonia (community) 20
- Lamb of God (Jesus), the Passover
 lamb discussion, paschal lamb 126,
 128, 157, 165, 170, 259, 260, 264,
 270, 271, 272, 281, 307
 language of war 350
 Lazarus 78, 148
 Leah 104
 lectionaries 255, 263
 legitimating (social) 18, 24,
 58, 64, 80, 140, 180, 184, 185, 212,
 215, 339, 369
 Leontopolis 93, 117, 118, 194
 Letter of Aristeas 88
 levels in Philo's exegesis 205
 library (Qumran, Essene) 106, 107,
 350
 light and darkness 223, 276, 341,
 342, 343, 344
 light, archetypal 331
 light, light motif 19, 24, 223, 230,
 273, 274, 276, 277–279, 288, 331,
 339, 341, 342, 343, 344,
 literal meaning (reading, observance,
 understanding) 35, 93, 94, 95, 96,
 102, 105, 180, 196, 215, 307, 309,
 326, 335
 literalists 92–104, 363
 literary approach 21, 23, 36, 37, 144,
 314
 locale 87, 111, 112, 219, 245, 274
 Logos 168, 208, 214, 215, 216
 lone genius (Jn author?) 67, 68, 69,
 71, 73, 74, 114, 115
 Lord's Supper, the Eucharist 4, 26,
 80, 82, 132, 264, 268, 272, 365
 love 20, 79, 223, 238, 288, 319, 334,
 348, 353, 372
 loyal, loyalty, disloyal 98, 104, 158,
 160, 188, 189, 197, 218, 219, 230,
 241, 249, 283, 316, 355, 374
- Maccabean 106, 159, 226, 228, 279,
 362
 Macedonia 323
 magi of Persia 330
 Malachi 229
 Mandaean 286
 manifesto (Qumran) 234, 343

- manna 259, 260, 263, 264, 265–268, 270, 282
 Martyn-Brown hypothesis 351
 martyr (sacrifice) 365
 Marxist sociology, non-Marxists 46
 Matthean community 86, 129, 136, 321
 Mediterranean (world) 14, 39, 40, 61, 67, 286
 membership 47, 247, 348, 363
 menstruants 226, 292
 Messiah 64, 78, 79, 133, 135, 136, 158, 221, 275, 295, 336
 messianism, messianic 60, 108, 146, 154, 163, 171, 220, 221, 223, 232, 266, 277
 metaphor 17, 21, 22, 39, 80, 81, 83, 114, 126, 131, 136, 141, 154, 162, 164, 166, 170, 174, 178, 185, 197, 233, 242, 254, 283, 289, 297, 307, 309, 310, 311, 325, 341, 365
 Methodists 51
 methods, methodology, methodological 1, 13, 16, 24, 25, 30–43, 48, 52, 68, 86, 91, 168, 187, 205, 216, 224, 255, 356, 361
 metropolis (Jerusalem) 196, 197
 Middle Platonism 205, 206, 217, 322
 mind (metaphor) 101, 196, 202, 208, 210
 minority, minority group 88, 192, 241, 321
 mirror, mirror-reading 34, 35, 36, 185
 misanthrop, misanthropic 323, 325
 Mishnah 75, 195, 292, 377
 missionary activity, mission 18, 21, 72, 138, 144, 177, 280, 286, 290, 298, 305, 306, 308
 misunderstanding(s) 18, 161, 165, 174, 243, 258, 303, 304
 model(s) (modern, sociological, social scientific) 2, 5, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 25, 28, 38–43, 45–65, 122, 175, 246, 281, 283, 284, 337
 monotheism 25, 96, 117
 Mormons (The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints) 53, 59
 Moses (Jesus as) 136, 266, 295
 Mount Zion 123, 126, 129, 140, 172
 Muslim (sects) 46
 mutual help, love 288, 365
 mystic, mysticism 15, 54, 58, 89, 94, 140, 190, 193, 195, 204
 myth(s), mythological language 2, 16, 17, 22, 23, 30, 94, 97, 127, 171, 200, 324, 354
 narrative (chronology) 144, 147, 152, 271
 narrative approach/point of view 36
 nation(s), national identity 47, 118, 166, 198, 207, 290, 304, 311, 312, 323, 324, 328, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 342, 345, 348, 359
 Nazarenes (Christians?) 75
 negligents 94, 345, 364
 Neoplatonic 204
 new (novel) religious movements (NRM), new religiona, new groups 4, 15, 28, 46, 52, 53, 55, 57, 58, 61, 185, 234, 357, 360, 365, 366, 370
 new basic narrative 365
 new Israel, true Israel 137, 138, 171
 New Jerusalem 225
 new revelation 55, 64, 360, 367
 new rites (Christians) 365
 new sign system 365
 new temple 119, 139, 166, 167, 168, 171, 172, 179, 183, 185, 196, 220, 222, 225, 228, 277, 295
 New Year feast, Rosh ha-Shanah 254, 255
 Newton, Isaac 5
 Nicodemus 17, 22, 124, 147, 154, 155, 258, 290, 294, 303, 311
 night (symbol) 124, 288
 Nile (Philo: symbol of passion) 117, 326, 327
 Noah 201
 non-believers 20, 118, 285
 non-Christians 54, 286, 311
 non-Jews, non-Jewish 87, 219, 286, 290, 299, 303, 304, 310, 322, 323, 331, 333, 335, 337, 348, 350, 351, 369
 non-Johannine Christians 286, 290
 non-Johannine sources 255
 non-physical, non-geographical 126, 127, 162, 164, 167, 170, 184
 normative Judaism 25, 193, 258
 North-America(n), America 6, 7, 26, 47, 53
 Norwegian (Neo-Norwegian, nynorsk) 3, 22, 291
 novel (see also new) 15, 53, 61, 122, 366

- NRSV (New Revised Standard Version) 45, 111, 238, 291, 375
 Numenius 91, 331
- objectivation (sociological) 30, 121, 292
- observe the Law, observance of the Law 92, 93, 94, 100, 102–103, 140, 157, 162, 206, 212, 218, 219, 230, 322, 358, 364, 373
- offer, offering(s) 126, 127, 130, 135, 171, 191, 194, 195, 199, 202, 221, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 236, 237, 238, 239, 244, 259
- offerings of the lips 236, 237
- Old Testament/Tanak 81, 87, 109, 127, 137, 158, 159, 179, 202, 217, 251, 276, 307, 325, 337, 345
- Onias (Leontopolis, temple) 93, 118, 194, 203
- openness (group boundaries) 51, 62, 359, 371
- organisational models 337
- Orthodox Church 51
- orthodoxy 18, 24, 25, 51, 117, 146
- orthopraxy 117
- ostraca (Qumran) 88, 113
- out-group 177
- outsiders 1, 18, 22, 29, 30, 36, 51, 63, 113, 177, 224, 285, 286, 287, 289, 290, 296, 299, 302, 306, 307, 308, 310, 314, 317, 318, 319, 321, 323, 336, 338, 342, 343, 344–349, 350, 351, 353
- over-interpretation 36, 116, 140, 255, 277, 278
- pagan(s) 120, 131, 193, 324, 325, 365
- PAM 43:246 (photocopy Qumran literature) 237
- Palestine, Palestinian 9, 13, 37, 49, 117, 187, 191, 195, 199, 293, 308, 315, 323, 330, 335
- Papyrus 88, 241, 298
- parables, parable-like 37, 126, 307
- Paraclete (see also the Spirit) 3, 74, 82, 83, 372
- parallelomania 240
- parent body, parent group, parent faith 2, 8, 26, 28, 50, 51, 55, 56, 60, 63, 64, 94, 185, 223, 239, 247, 283, 284, 316, 317, 353, 355, 357, 360, 362, 363, 364, 366, 372, 374
- Parthians 323
- particularism 192, 322, 327, 332, 345
- particularities, Johannine (literary, historical and theological) 5, 35, 51, 68, 82, 130, 172, 256, 285, 359, 365, 374
- Passover 123, 137, 140, 147, 148, 153, 155, 156, 170, 243, 251, 252, 259–273, 282, 305, 325
- Passover meal (Jesus as) 264, 270, 271, 272
- patterns of behaviour 16, 37, 122, 224
- patterns of organisation 110, 111, 336, 338
- patterns of protest 247, 336
- Paul, Pauline churches, Pauline literature, Pauline letters 4, 5, 14, 16, 39, 70, 75, 114, 131, 132, 133, 136, 138, 151, 162, 170, 171, 174, 193, 209, 220, 242, 254, 272, 273, 290, 306, 325
- peculiar language 23, 332
- Peleg 225, 226
- Pentecost 253, 254, 255
- people (laos) 81, 310, 311, 312, 314, 324
- people of God 81, 137, 140, 171, 312
- Persia, Persians 323, 330, 338
- personal-ethical piety 127
- Pesher to Habakkuk (1QpHab) 108, 227
- Peter (the apostle) 3, 14, 81, 83, 303, 366
- Pharaoh 214, 325, 326
- Pharisees 10, 12, 32, 46, 51, 79, 80, 129, 193, 278, 294, 307
- philanthropy, humanity 322, 323, 331, 334, 348
- Philo of Alexandria *passim*
- Philo community 1, 86–105, 115, 116, 197, 216, 244, 248, 321, 327, 355, 357, 364
- Pilate 296
- pilgrimage, pilgrim festivals 92, 104, 123, 155, 188, 191, 192, 195, 198, 199, 210, 211, 218, 252, 253, 262, 302
- plantation 233, 234
- Plato, Platonism, (semi-)Platonic 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 127, 134, 190, 203, 204, 205, 206, 211, 212, 217, 297, 322, 329, 377

- Pliny 105
 Plutarch 297, 331
 pneuma, pneumatic (worship) 138, 179, 233, 242
 pneumatology 223
 pogrom 86, 88, 205, 323, 326, 328, 330, 336
 politeia (politeuma) 86, 97, 99, 101, 116, 327
 political religion 118
 polytheism 55, 323, 326, 328, 335, 371
 pork, eating 323, 333, 335
 post-Easter community, understanding, perspective 32, 78, 130, 150, 151, 161, 162, 163, 167, 170, 172, 316
 post-modern 42
 post-resurrection(al) 31, 32, 74, 79, 83, 150
 post-temple reactions 120
 practical-epistemological reasons (for observances of the Law) 212
 prayer (replaced) 190, 212, 218, 230, 333
 prayer houses 105, 355
 pre-Johannine 144, 158, 161
 pre-Markian 144
 pre-modern 144, 323
 pre-sectarian (Qumran) 108, 111, 151, 231
 precincts, temple 160, 275
 predestination 223, 311
 priest(s) (see also High Priest, priesthood, wicked priest) 129, 130, 148, 188, 207, 211, 215, 218, 226, 228, 230, 231, 239, 254, 264, 270, 276, 335, 339, 340, 347, 348
 priestess 324
 priesthood 117, 127, 134, 140, 190, 192, 207, 280, 325, 331–334, 335
 priestly clothes and vestment (transferred) 213, 215, 280
 privileged classes 60–61
 proletarian 60–61
 prophet(s), prophetic 107, 127, 130, 135, 145, 158, 159, 181, 202, 258, 266, 267, 337, 345
 propitiatory sacrifice 132
 proselytes 302, 305, 306, 312, 318, 327, 328, 335, 336, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 351, 362
 Protestantism 142
 Prussian Pietists 51
 Psalm(s) 127, 151, 158
 pseudepigrapha, pseudepigraphic 127, 220
 purged, purging 55, 64, 157, 368, 369
 purification, purified 58, 124, 145, 147, 155, 157, 165, 231, 239–240, 270, 338, 344, 363
 Purim 254, 255
 purity 127, 147, 160, 223, 229, 247, 346, 347, 362
 Pythagoras, Pythagorean, Pythagoreanism 101, 206, 329
 qualified group (strong group) 69, 70, 74, 79, 85, 98, 112, 113, 114
 Qumran community *passim*
 R. Johanan ben Zakkai 119
 rabbinism, rabbinical Judaism 52, 75, 86, 89, 119, 120, 127, 134, 135, 191, 193, 220, 251, 261, 262, 274, 276, 277, 345
 ransom (tax) 199, 232
 reader-response 22
 realised eschatology 130, 182, 223
 recruitment 50, 63, 337, 358
 redaction criticism, redaction-critical approach 3, 4, 22, 30, 33, 35, 37, 38, 68, 74, 125, 169
 reductionism, reductionist 61, 69, 70, 118, 192, 356
 redundant, redundancy (replacement theory) 22, 140, 175, 180, 183, 253
 reformist, reform (renewal), reform group, reformer, reformation 12, 14, 23, 48, 49, 51, 62, 63, 101, 135, 143, 153, 157, 158, 159, 359, 360
 refurbish, refurbishment 55, 60, 63, 64, 122, 143, 175, 176, 353, 360, 361, 363, 366, 367, 368, 370, 373
 reinterpretation (transference) 127, 142, 254, 259, 283
 rejection model (temple relationship generally in Jn) 175–176, 185, 246, 281
 rejection of the Temple 124, 132, 134, 160, 181, 198, 217, 219, 221, 223, 227, 244, 245, 246, 269, 273, 277, 283, 316, 358, 364, 367
 relationships to outsiders (matrix of) 296, 301, 306, 317–319
 remnant, righteous remnant 14, 50, 227, 339

- replacement theory, theology 8, 50,
 63, 121, 132, 133, 136–143, 165,
 171, 183, 184, 185, 220, 224, 243,
 251, 260, 263, 265, 268, 272, 276,
 280,
 replacement, logic of 142, 184, 185
 response(s) to the world 48, 49, 63, 359
 revolution 48, 49, 52, 122, 290
 rites 121, 127, 143, 155, 177, 211,
 212, 273, 277, 282, 365
 river (symbolic) 214, 326, 327
 Roman(s) 21, 27, 45, 61, 79, 86, 87,
 88, 92, 94, 118, 119, 120, 121, 135,
 144, 187, 195, 197, 199, 226,
 296–302, 308, 310, 315, 317, 318,
 323, 325, 330, 333, 334, 337, 338,
 365, 366, 369, 370, 372, 373, 374
 Rome 88, 192, 197, 218
 Russian Stundists 51

 Sabbath 101, 124, 137, 140, 188,
 194, 230, 231, 243, 252, 254, 256,
 257, 259, 262, 263, 271, 275, 346
 sacrifice *passim*
 Sadducees, Sadduceism 10, 12, 15,
 51, 107, 129, 193
 Samaritan(s), Samaritan woman 15,
 63, 80, 87, 93, 118, 120, 123, 124,
 125, 126, 147, 154, 159, 176, 177,
 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 244, 246,
 266, 287, 289–296, 298, 299, 300,
 301, 302, 303, 306, 310, 314, 316,
 317, 318, 351, 356, 371, 374
 Samuel the Small (Samuel the Lesser)
 75
 sanctions 51, 339, 340
 Sanhedrin 118, 292
 saviour, salvation (of the world) 176,
 181, 182, 293, 294, 300
 school(s), philosophical schools,
 Johannine school 1, 20, 21, 22, 45,
 52, 68, 69, 70, 71, 80, 83, 85, 87,
 93, 105, 115, 262, 329, 356
 Scientology Church 53
 Second Temple Period 10, 117, 207,
 251
 sect, sectarian, sectarianism (see cult)
 passim
 secularisation, secular world 7, 46,
 47, 56, 61, 70
 segregaton, segregated community 24,
 45, 109, 110, 111, 112, 125, 222,
 223, 226, 228, 240, 342, 353, 354,
 357, 362, 374

 self-defintion 8, 12, 60, 90, 322
 self-designation 52, 109, 338, 340
 separation 10, 17, 58, 63, 64, 67, 77,
 110, 122, 140, 211, 222, 238, 241,
 316, 332, 337, 362
 Septuagint (LXX) 89, 99, 101, 102,
 158, 168, 266, 324, 375
 Seventeenth Benediction 120
 sexual intercourse 226, 228
 sheep 156, 307–310, 311, 318
 shepherd 4, 68, 80, 81, 140, 307,
 309
 Shrine of the Book (Israeli Museum)
 236
 Sibylline oracles 93
 Siloam 124, 276
 Simon Maccabaeus 106
 Sinai 257, 267, 268, 269, 270
 Singer's Prayer Book 75
 Sitz im Leben 6, 18, 111, 253, 261
 social anthropology (method and
 models) 13, 14, 19, 23, 24, 40, 41,
 42, 141, 286
 socio-historical approach 41, 82, 91,
 216, 323
 socio-literary approach 23, 24
 socio-redaction(al) criticism/approach
 3, 29, 41, 125, 287
 socio-rhetorical method 16, 36
 sociography, sociographic issues 37,
 70, 224
 sociological approach, sociology 1, 3,
 4, 8, 12, 13, 16, 19, 23, 24, 28, 30,
 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 45,
 46, 62, 138, 141, 231, 321, 356,
 357
 sociological key (to the understanding
 of John) 259
 sociology of knowledge 16, 30, 62
 Socrates 103, 322
 solar-lunar calendar 223
 Solon 297, 329
 Son of Man 17, 163, 171, 221
 Son, Son of God 139, 140, 221, 242,
 256, 268, 280, 281, 302
 sons of Light 24, 339, 341, 342
 sons of man 342, 343
 sons of the pit 110
 sons of wickedness (Qumran) 337
 soteriology, soteriological 12, 121,
 139, 309, 312
 soul (metaphor, see also body) 99,
 101, 102, 104, 162, 178, 191, 196,
 200, 203, 206, 208–209, 210, 211,

- 213, 215, 216, 217, 218, 242, 243,
244, 245, 323
- source-criticism 16, 33, 38
- Sparta 329
- spirit and truth 139, 164, 166, 179,
180, 182, 183, 184, 246, 294
- spiritualisation 124, 126–127, 136,
182, 194, 217, 218, 233
- stars, astrology 211, 323, 328
- Stephen 133, 136, 149, 174, 202
- Stuhlmacher, P. 171
- Stoicism 99, 178, 182, 198, 202, 205,
206, 211, 220, 322, 329
- stranger(s) 17, 287, 288, 328, 349
- structuralism 5, 22, 24, 49, 190
- structure of temple references (Jn,
Philo, Qumran) 123, 196, 225
- substitutes (temple etc.) 131, 136,
166, 222, 239, 283
- Sukenik, E. 106
- supersession, supersede (replacement
theory) 121, 132, 134, 136, 142,
177, 180, 253, 278
- supplement (temple) 222, 239
- symbolism 124, 145, 159, 170, 171,
188, 234, 272, 273, 297
- symposium (Therapeutae, Philo) 262
- synagogue 3, 6, 8, 9, 17, 19, 20, 22,
29, 33, 38, 63, 68, 69, 75–79, 83,
86, 105, 114, 121, 122, 132, 137,
140, 141, 172, 182, 223, 255, 261,
262, 263, 272, 275, 286, 308, 312,
313, 314–317, 330, 335, 338, 351,
353, 355, 357, 358, 359, 366, 368,
369, 372, 373, 374
- Synoptics, synoptic 4, 5, 14, 35, 72,
77, 78, 80, 85, 87, 123, 129, 143,
144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 158,
252, 256, 263, 271, 272, 288, 289,
291, 297, 298, 302, 306, 310, 315
- Syria 195, 298, 323, 330
- tabernacle (see also feast of Booths)
128, 134, 137, 191, 194, 200, 208,
210, 216, 218, 243
- Talmud 75, 377
- Targum 255
- teach, teaching 5, 7, 20, 45, 46, 58,
64, 82, 83, 91, 100, 118, 132, 133,
136, 149, 182, 222, 223, 258, 274,
275, 304, 306, 315, 331, 337, 348
- Teacher of Righteousness 64, 222,
223, 337
- temple (not) made by hands 133,
164, 171, 173–174 194, 210, 211,
349
- temple adherent and adherence 117,
119, 131, 155, 156, 159, 160, 161,
163, 190, 198, 209, 216, 219, 231,
232, 236, 244, 248, 252, 253, 278,
295, 299, 301, 305, 306, 317, 318,
357, 374
- temple attitude 24, 36, 43, 92, 110,
121, 128–136, 146, 148, 156, 158,
160, 164, 170, 182, 183, 188, 192,
193, 194, 195, 197, 205, 221, 224,
226, 232, 240–249, 259, 264, 269,
273, 281, 282, 283, 304, 316, 318,
355, 359, 363, 367, 368, 369
- temple cleansing *passim*
- temple destruction 26, 80, 117, 118,
119–122, 123, 128, 130, 133, 134,
135, 138, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145,
146, 147, 149, 157, 159, 165, 166,
169, 173, 176, 181, 184, 185, 227,
245, 283, 295, 362, 365, 368, 370,
373
- temple images 109, 212, 217, 244
- temple metaphor 131, 170, 174, 220
- temple mysticism 140
- Temple of Jerusalem 1, 25, 26, 29,
63, 93, 97, 106, 111, 118, 119, 120,
121, 123, 124, 126, 128, 131, 132,
133, 135, 136, 138, 140, 147, 152,
160, 162, 165, 166, 167, 173, 174,
175, 179, 189, 191, 192, 193, 194,
195, 196–201, 202, 203, 207, 208,
209, 210, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217,
218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 225–228,
231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 238, 239,
240, 244, 245, 246, 247, 260, 295,
299, 315, 317, 324, 330, 353, 358
- temple of man (miqdash adam) 162,
234, 235, 346
- temple tax 97, 129, 130, 164, 189,
195, 199–200, 217, 218, 231, 232,
239, 364
- temple, criticism of the 133, 159,
194, 223, 229, 243, 355
- temple, ideas 120, 166, 208, 209,
213, 216, 217, 243, 248, 355
- temple, Jesus' body as temple, the
body temple 126, 159, 161, 162,
163, 164, 166, 167, 174, 175, 179,
185, 207, 260
- temple, true(er) temple 137, 138, 178,
180, 210, 212, 217, 220, 243, 275
- temple-related festivals and related

- features 110, 119, 123, 128, 141, 143, 188, 189, 190, 194, 196, 203, 206, 213–216, 218, 225, 235, 240, 243, 249, 251, 254, 273
 tension
 degree of tension 59, 122, 128, 175, 185, 245, 248, 251, 279, 284, 336, 354, 363
 low-tension, high-tension 55, 56, 57, 59, 64, 98, 176, 246, 248, 281–284, 317–319, 328, 332, 334–336, 351, 355, 360, 364, 367, 373, 374
 social tension 46, 63, 122, 247, 248, 321, 325, 333, 334, 357, 358
 testify, testimony (scriptures to Jesus) 251, 257, 268, 269, 270, 283, 368, 369
 Therapeutae 45, 94, 95, 104, 219, 247, 262, 324
 third family (between Jews' and Gentiles) 323
 Thomas (disciple) 81, 167, 301
 Tiberius Alexander (Philo's nephew) 88, 94
 Torah 26, 94, 117, 120, 140, 193, 278, 358
 traditional Judaism 13, 93, 94, 138, 148, 168, 183, 261, 283, 311, 363, 366, 368
 traditional material 38, 53, 130, 145, 310, 313
 traditional-critical approach 144
 Transcendental Meditation 53
 transferred or spiritualised temple and offerings 109, 126, 127, 128, 143, 162, 163, 166, 175, 176, 182, 185, 194, 196, 201–215, 217, 218, 222, 225, 229, 231, 232–235, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 269, 307, 362, 364
 true humans 324
 true Israel 171, 324
 true worship(pers) 138, 139, 177, 178, 179, 181, 183, 282
 Twelfth Benediction 75, 77
 two-level drama in Jn (Martyn's first and second level) 3, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 68, 71, 74–82, 83, 116, 121, 125, 126, 145, 146, 150, 151, 152, 153, 156, 163, 181, 182, 183, 184, 187, 287, 289, 295, 297, 306, 307, 308, 311, 312, 314, 316, 318, 368
 Typhus, the golden calf 327
 typology(ies), typological interpretation 2, 6, 12, 14, 15, 24, 25, 27, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 126, 142, 158, 260, 266, 267, 357, 365
 unclean, uncleanness 226, 291, 292, 343, 349
 union (Qumran) 18, 109, 162, 338, 362
 universalism 192, 202, 322, 323, 332, 333, 334, 345
 unknown festival (Jn 5:1) 123, 253, 254–259
 vain offerings, in vain 229, 230
 vessel (share vessel with) 291, 292, 303
 villa (Qumran theory) 106
 vine metaphor 4, 68, 81, 170
 Water Gate 276
 water metaphor (transferred) 126, 128, 154, 165, 179, 180, 181, 183, 223, 266, 273, 276–277, 278, 282
 we-group, 'we' 33, 71, 95, 230, 293, 294
 Wicked Priest 106, 228
 wine metaphor 154, 268
 Wirkungsgeschichte 104
 Wisdom 208, 214, 322
 withdrawal (from the society etc.) 48, 50, 62, 63, 64, 222, 285, 289, 358, 359
 works of law/thanksgiving 101, 234
 Yahiad 52, 109, 110, 112, 113, 115, 162, 227, 228, 229, 232, 234, 235, 240, 337, 338, 340, 341, 342, 344, 348, 351, 361, 362
 Yahad 110, 112, 113, 115, 162, 228, 229, 232, 235, 240, 337, 338, 344, 348, 351, 361, 362
 Zeus 197, 280
 'they' 95, 294
 'you' 72, 101, 181, 293, 294

MODERN AUTHORS

- Aalen, S. 267
 Abegg, M. 224
 Abercrombie, N. 29
 Adna, J. 128, 130, 131, 132, 136,
 144, 145, 146, 149, 150, 157, 158,
 159, 161, 171, 172, 173, 184, 219,
 225, 233, 235, 373
 Aland, B. 72, 123, 156, 305, 375
 Aland, K. 72, 123, 156, 305, 375
 Amir, Y. 197, 198, 210, 211
 Andersen, H. 29
 Anderson, H. 133, 261
 Anderson, P. N. 261
 Armstrong, K. 120
 Arnaldez, R. 86, 88, 89, 90, 216,
 322, 323
 Ashton, J. 5, 6, 16, 23, 25, 32, 33,
 74, 77, 148, 360
 Astren, F. 87
 Aune, D. 2, 9, 11, 25, 117, 220
 Avemarie, F. 129
- Baasland, E. 17, 22, 24, 27, 34
 Bacon, B. W. 5
 Bainbridge, W. S. 26, 27, 46, 48,
 52–62, 63, 64, 69, 122, 143, 185,
 241, 357, 360–366, 370
 Barclay, J. 15
 Barrera, J. T. 11, 106, 113, 230,
 344
 Barrett, C. K. 4, 5, 21, 25, 31, 32,
 45, 47, 51, 67, 72, 73, 74, 76, 79,
 80, 82, 115, 119, 124, 136, 137,
 144, 146, 147, 155, 157, 158, 159,
 164, 168, 170, 171, 172, 177, 178,
 179, 181, 182, 183, 242, 243, 244,
 254, 255, 257, 258, 261, 262, 264,
 266, 269, 272, 273, 276, 279, 280,
 288, 289, 291, 294, 295, 297, 298,
 304, 305, 308, 310, 311, 371
 Barton, S. 6, 10, 16, 21, 22, 25, 34,
 35, 46, 69, 70, 139, 140, 371
 Bauckham, R. 34, 35, 36, 145, 341
 Bauer, W. 5, 159, 302
 Baumgarten, A. 11, 12, 14, 51, 52,
 189, 232
 Baumgartner, W. 109, 238
- Beall, T. S. 106, 112, 221, 236, 345,
 348
 Beasley-Murray, G. R. 160, 180, 260,
 262, 266
 Beavis, M. A. 14
 Becker, H. 54
 Bekken, P. J. 137
 Bell, H. I. 88
 Belle, G. van 4, 6
 Berger, K. 21, 22, 35, 52, 119, 146,
 181
 Berger, P. 16, 18, 20, 30, 121, 321
 Bergmeier, R. 9, 221
 Bernstein, M. 231
 Best, T. 41
 Betz, H. D. 145
 Betz, O. 110
 Bieringer, R. 3, 8, 76, 136, 137, 314,
 319
 Bietenhard, H. 134
 Bilde, P. 4, 52, 117, 366
 Billerbeck, P. 276
 Billings, T. H. 99, 100, 101
 Birnbaum, E. 87, 88, 92, 192
 Blasi, A. J. 4, 13
 Blass, F. 304
 Blenkinsopp, J. 48
 Boer, M. C. de 5, 32
 Bogart, J. 6, 19, 20
 Boismard, M.-È. 149, 152
 Boissevain, J. 24, 49
 Bonani, G. 224
 Borg, M. J. 117
 Borgen, P. 17, 23, 32, 82, 86, 87,
 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93–94, 99, 137,
 144, 146, 149–152, 158, 161, 188,
 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196,
 205, 206, 216, 219, 242, 256, 257,
 261, 323, 327, 328, 329, 332
 Bornkamm, G. 23
 Bousset, W. 89
 Bowman, J. 255
 Brante, T. 29
 Braun, H. 21, 220
 Brodie, T. L. 5, 6, 38
 Brooke, G. J. 105, 187, 189, 219,
 234–235

- Broshi, M. 224
 Brown, R. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 20, 21, 22, 27, 31, 32, 33, 36, 68, 72, 79, 81, 82, 85, 119, 124, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 144, 145, 146, 147, 154, 172, 173, 177, 179, 182, 183, 184, 241, 243, 253, 254, 255, 270–272, 274, 276, 277, 279, 280, 285, 286, 288, 289, 303, 308, 312, 314, 353, 354, 357, 359, 366, 372
 Brownlee, W. H. 110
 Bruce, S. 48, 61
 Bréhier, E. 90, 93, 100, 190, 216
 Bull, K.-M. 1, 2, 18, 19, 77
 Bultmann, R. 2, 4, 5, 6, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 31, 33, 80, 114, 115, 138, 144, 149, 172, 177, 183, 262, 269, 286, 293, 303, 307, 308
 Burge, G. M. 68, 73, 80, 82, 124
 Burke, P. 40
 Burrows, M. 110, 236
 Bury, R. G. 212
 Busse, U. 117, 124, 145
 Böttrich, C. 131–132, 137, 219
 Carmignac, J. 110, 236, 237
 Carson, D. A. 34, 68, 72, 76–79, 136, 145, 177, 180, 181, 263, 269, 271, 292, 298, 303, 305, 308
 Casey, M. 8, 136, 140
 Cazeaux, J. 91, 99, 100, 103
 Charlesworth, J. H. 8, 9, 10, 29, 64, 73, 110, 136, 223, 236–237, 240, 242
 Chilton, B. 117, 140, 142, 145, 157, 286
 Christiansen, E. J. 109, 220
 Christiansen, I. 203–205, 215
 Cohen, N. G. 86, 191
 Cohen, S. J. D. 9, 10, 45
 Cohn, L. 98
 Collins, J. J. 93, 325, 332
 Colson, F. H. 97, 98, 195, 211, 216, 375
 Cook, E. 224
 Cowley, A. E. 238
 Craffert, P. 14, 26, 38, 41, 55, 60
 Cross, F. M. 105, 106, 113, 338, 339, 350
 Cruse, C. F. 73
 Cryer, F. 106, 108, 113
 Cullmann, O. 6, 18, 20, 21, 32, 68, 80, 136
 Culpepper, A. R. 4, 6, 9, 19, 20, 21, 35, 36, 52, 68, 73, 124, 314, 316
 Dahl, N. A. 6, 23, 32, 76, 138, 190, 257, 268, 286, 290, 305, 308, 313, 318
 Danby, H. D. D. 75, 292
 Daniel, S. 211, 212, 327
 Daniélou, J. 93, 94, 242
 Daube, D. 291, 292
 Daumas, F. 45
 Davies, P. R. 9, 10, 106, 110, 221, 222, 224, 226, 228, 229, 232, 239, 240, 338, 348
 Davies, W. D. 77, 124, 136, 140
 Debrunner, A. 304
 Deines, R. 229, 235, 336, 345, 346, 348, 350
 Dillon, J. 204, 205
 Dimant, D. 219, 235, 348
 Dodd, C. H. 21, 124, 136, 144, 149, 151, 153, 157, 158, 170, 174, 178, 188, 242, 262, 305
 Dokka, T. S. 22
 Donceel, R. 106
 Donceel-Voute, P. f. 106
 Doudna, G. 108, 113
 Douglas, D. 224
 Douglas, M. 14, 23, 29, 46, 139
 Dunn, J. D. G. 25, 29, 30, 117, 118, 120, 123, 127, 129, 130, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 140, 141, 143, 145, 253, 286
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 237
 Ego, B. 129
 Elgvin, T. 113
 Elliott, J. 13, 14, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 49–51, 52, 53, 60, 62, 63, 67, 69, 136, 139, 143, 287, 357–360, 361, 365, 371
 Engelstad, F. 39
 Epstein, I. 75
 Eshel, E. 113
 Esler, P. F. 3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 14, 25, 26, 42, 112, 228
 Evans, C. A. 110, 145, 220
 Feldman, L. H. 89
 Feldmeier, R. 287, 345
 Feleppa, R. 42
 Fiorenza, E. S. 114, 127, 189, 220, 225, 226

- Flanagan, J. W. 39
 Fortna, R. T. 5, 6, 16, 33
 Fossum, J. 15
 Fredouille, J. C. 303
 Frey, J. 81, 286, 296, 298, 304, 305,
 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313
 Fronrobert, C. 324, 345
 Früchtel, U. 190, 191, 193, 195, 203,
 210, 216
 Frühwald-König, J. 3, 8, 29, 34, 141,
 146, 158, 252
 Fuglseth, K. 4, 5, 194
 Fuks, A. 87, 88, 89
- Gadamer, H. G. 32
 Gager, J. G. 14
 Garrett, S. R. 40, 42, 46
 Gaston, L. 123
 Geertz, C. 13, 62
 Gill, R. 13, 47
 Glock, C. Y. 54
 Golb, N. 106, 109
 Goldschmidt, L. 75
 Goldstein, J. 322
 Goodenough, E. R. 87, 90, 93, 95,
 99, 101, 190, 192, 193, 194, 216
 Goodman, M. 105, 109, 112, 120
 Grabbe, L. L. 117
 Grenness, C. E. 39
 Guilbert, P. 110, 236, 237
 Guilding, A. 32, 255, 262, 263
 Gärtner, B. 110, 127, 162, 189, 216,
 219, 221, 222, 225, 228, 233, 234,
 239, 248, 262, 263, 266, 270
- Haase, W. 190
 Hadas-Lebel, M. 195, 323
 Haenchen, E. 136, 158, 177
 Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. 204
 Hartman, L. 115, 118
 Harvey, G. 219
 Haverkamp, S. 45
 Hay, D. 94, 95, 99
 Heckel, U. 287, 345
 Heinemann, I. 90, 190, 191, 192,
 193, 195, 201, 208, 210, 212, 216,
 322
 Hemminger, H. 46
 Hempel, C. 229
 Hengel, M. 4, 20, 21, 30, 68, 72, 73,
 77, 109, 115, 121, 129, 130, 131,
 136, 171, 172, 184, 191, 298, 336,
 337, 345, 348, 350
 Hill, S. 29
- Holladay, W. 229
 Holmberg, B. 10, 13, 16, 24, 25, 27,
 34, 37, 39, 40, 41, 55, 60, 61, 365
 Honigman, S. 322
 Horbury, W. 77
 Horrell, D. 13, 38, 40, 41
 Horsley, R. A. 13
 Hoskyns, E. C. 21, 89, 263, 276,
 297, 303
 Howard, W. F. 82
 Hudson, O. 45
 Hägerland, T. 35
 Høgenhaven, J. 108, 113
- Jaffe, M. S. 117
 Jeremias, J. 117
 Jocz, J. 75
 Johnson, B. 45, 47
 Johnstone, R. L. 54
 Jones, H. S. 74, 78, 91, 97, 159,
 177, 202, 328
 Jonge, H. J. 76, 291
 Jonge, M. de 17, 32, 33, 121
 Judge, E. A. 12
 Jull, T. 224
- Kahn, J. G. 97, 98
 Kalleberg, R. 39
 Kampen, J. 127, 219, 225, 226, 231
 Karavidopoulos, J. 72, 123, 156, 305,
 375
 Kasher, A. 88
 Kautzsch, E. 238
 Kee, H. C. 12, 13, 14, 37, 39, 52,
 138
 Kerr, A. 117, 120, 122, 136, 142,
 252
 Kieffer, R. 124, 136, 159, 170, 171,
 293
 Kimelman, R. 77
 Kinzer, M. 140
 Klauck, H.-J. 85
 Klinghardt, M. 110, 338
 Klinzing, G. 110, 119, 120, 127, 189,
 219, 220, 221, 222, 228, 233, 234,
 236, 237, 238, 248
 Knibb, M. A. 110, 234, 237, 348
 Knohl, I. 219
 Koehler, L. 119, 238
 Koester, C. R. 1, 136, 165, 166,
 167, 228
 Korsnes, O. 29
 Kraft, R. A. 99
 Kysar, R. 7, 19, 23, 68, 73, 140

- Käsemann, E. 2, 4, 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, 51, 52, 139, 286, 288
- Lamarche, P. 23
- Lamb, W. R. M. 102
- Lamouille, A. 149, 152
- Langbrandter, W. 9, 18, 33–34
- Lange, A. 129
- Larsson, E. 133
- Leistner, R. 291
- Lemche, N. P. 247, 337
- Leroy, H. 18, 23, 165, 303
- León-Dufour, X. 32
- Liddell, H. G. 74, 78, 91, 97, 159, 177, 202, 328
- Lieu, J. M. 67, 85, 122, 140, 316
- Lightfoot, R. H. 178
- Lindars, B. 68, 136, 144, 145, 146, 148, 154, 156, 158, 159, 160, 165, 166, 242, 274, 279, 292, 308, 311
- Liver, J. 189, 231
- Lohse, E. 110, 236
- Luckmann, T. 16, 30, 121
- Luz, U. 289
- Léon-Dufour, X. 32
- MacDonald, M. Y. 14
- Mack, B. L. 14, 93, 104, 204, 205, 215
- Magness, J. 106
- Malherbe, A. J. 12
- Malina, B. J. 4, 14, 15, 19, 23, 24, 27, 30, 36, 39, 42, 49, 67, 118, 121, 158, 161, 286, 291
- Manns, F. 254, 255
- Marcus, R. 207, 375, 377
- Marsh, J. 123
- Martinussen, W. 69
- Martyn, J. L. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 17, 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 68, 74–82, 139, 146, 243, 260, 286, 307, 308, 309, 312, 314, 353
- Martínez, F. G. 11, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 113, 220, 221, 224, 225, 226, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 239, 344, 346, 349, 377
- Mattill, A. J. Jr. 68
- May, D. M. 13
- McCaffrey, J. 124
- McEleney, N. J. 25, 117
- McKay, H. 263, 315
- McKelvey, R. J. 123, 127, 190, 202, 233
- Mead, A. H. 298
- Meeks, W. A. 2, 3, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, 67, 68, 69, 77, 139, 285, 286, 307, 325, 354, 357, 371, 372
- Mendelson, A. 86, 87, 89–90, 93, 99, 104–105, 191, 192, 194, 197, 198, 216, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 329, 332
- Menken, M. J. J. 32
- Metso, S. 234
- Michaelis, W. 278
- Milik, J. T. 110, 236
- Miquel, P. 45
- Moloney, F. J. 17, 19, 279, 299
- Moore, S. D. 22
- Morris, L. 177
- Motyer, S. 8, 16, 34, 35, 38, 117, 119
- Moxnes, H. 13, 14, 40, 41
- Mussner, F. 32
- Müller, M. 48
- Neirynck, F. 144, 149, 151, 152
- Nelson, G. 54
- Neusner, J. 140, 145
- Newsom, C. A. 106, 107, 230
- Neyrey, J. 1, 2, 4, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 30, 42, 136, 139
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 118
- Niebuhr, H. R. 2, 12, 15, 45, 46, 47
- Niebuhr, K.-W. 193
- Niehoff, M. 197, 325
- Nielsen, E. 237
- Nikiprowetzky, V. 86, 91, 93, 101, 192, 204, 212, 216, 219
- Nissen, J. 13
- Olsson, B. 14, 23, 38, 124
- Onuki, T. 3, 18, 19, 23, 32, 80, 286
- Østenstad, G. 5
- Otzen, B. 237
- Overman, J. A. 140, 321
- O'Connor, J. M. 110, 229
- O'Day, G. R. 8, 141
- O'Dea, T. 2, 26, 45, 321
- Painter, J. 1, 4
- Pancaro, S. 3, 77, 81, 82, 138, 140, 141–142, 168, 243, 256, 257, 258, 276, 278, 280, 311, 315, 316
- Peirce, C. S. 42
- Pelletier, A. 88, 325

- Petersen, N. R. 4, 23, 24
 Philonenko, M. 237
 Pilhofer, P. 219
 Pollefeyt, D. 3, 8, 76, 136, 137, 314, 319
 Pope, L. 45
 Potterie, I. de la 23
 Pouilly, J. 110, 237
 Price, J. L. 240
 Puech, E. 110

 Qimron, E. 108, 230, 238, 346
 Quast, K. B. 1
 Quispel, G. 240

 Rahlfs, A. 375
 Rahner, J. 3, 34
 Rebell, W. 19
 Reinhartz, A. 8, 76, 77, 78, 91–92, 319, 371
 Reiter, S. 98
 Rensberger, D. 1, 6, 7, 19, 20
 Reydam-Schils, G. J. 99
 Richardson, J. T. 54
 Richter, G. 34
 Riesenfeld, H. 127
 Ringren, H. 109, 219
 Robbins, V. 14, 16, 36, 49
 Roberts, K. A. 47, 54, 58
 Robinson, J. A. T. 77, 304, 308, 309
 Rohrbaugh, R. L. 4, 14, 23, 24, 30, 34, 38, 39, 40, 67, 118, 121, 158, 161, 286, 291
 Roloff, J. 4, 79, 145
 Rothstein, M. 4, 52, 366
 Rowland, C. 10
 Runia, D. T. 91, 99, 188, 190, 205, 212, 216, 217, 241, 242, 262, 375

 Safrai, S. 121
 Saldarini, A. J. 14, 67, 85, 86, 129
 Sanders, E. P. 11, 12, 14, 117, 118, 119, 123, 129, 131, 140, 145, 171, 196, 345
 Sanders, J. T. 13, 14, 15, 25, 45, 53
 Sandmel, S. 87, 89, 90, 190, 192, 240, 242
 Saunders, T. J. 212
 Savinel, P. 213
 Schiffman, L. H. 9, 10, 45, 77, 107, 109, 110, 219, 222, 230, 239, 338
 Schlatter, A. 253, 297, 300
 Schmidt, F. 219, 236, 247, 337

 Schnackenburg, R. 31, 68, 76, 79, 81, 136, 150, 157, 158, 169, 170, 177, 178, 180, 253, 254, 255, 263, 276, 279, 291, 292, 297, 298, 307, 308
 Schnelle, U. 3, 4, 5, 22, 33, 34, 38, 68, 71, 77, 80, 148, 169
 Scholer, J. M. 332
 Scholtissek, K. 32, 34
 Schottroff, L. 5
 Schrenk, G. 129, 130, 135, 141, 158, 160, 163, 172, 202, 274, 275
 Schwartz, D. R. 5, 219
 Schweizer, E. 6, 81
 Schürer, E. 111, 117, 233, 338
 Scott, J. M. 188
 Scott, R. 74, 78, 91, 97, 159, 177, 202, 328
 Scroggs, R. 2, 12, 13
 Segal, A. F. 9, 10, 17, 117, 118, 140, 192
 Segovia, F. 4, 6, 10, 19, 20, 285
 Seland, T. 24, 27, 40, 49, 90, 104, 188, 190, 215, 322, 332
 Shavit, Y. 106
 Shroyer, M. J. 93, 94, 96, 98
 Siegert, F. 132
 Simon, M. 119
 Singer, S. 75
 Skarsten, R. 87, 194
 Smallwood, E. M. 199
 Smith, D. Moody 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 20, 33, 36, 67, 68, 72, 73, 259, 285
 Stanton, G. N. 14, 40, 85, 86
 Stark, R. 26, 28, 46, 48, 52–62, 63, 64, 69, 122, 143, 185, 241, 357, 360, 361, 362, 363, 365, 366, 370
 Stark, W. 46, 48, 51, 52
 Starobinski-Safran, E. 216
 Stegemann, H. 106, 107, 108, 109, 112, 189, 219, 221, 222, 226, 229, 230, 231, 233, 235, 239, 338, 345, 347, 348, 350, 362
 Stendahl, K. 9
 Sterling, G. E. 87, 90, 91, 94, 188, 192, 205, 322, 331
 Steudel, A. 348
 Stibbe, M. W. G. 4, 30, 35, 36, 76
 Stone, M. 118, 120
 Stowers, S. 79
 Strack, H. 75, 120, 276
 Strathmann, H. 178
 Strugnell, J. 108, 230, 231, 346

- Svartvik, J. 136
 Sweeney, M. A. 261

 Talmon, S. 24, 106, 108, 219
 Taylor, N. H. 15
 Tcherikover, V. A. 87, 88, 89
 Terian, A. 207, 215
 Thackeray, H. St. J. 45, 210, 377
 Theissen, G. 2, 7, 13, 26, 32, 36, 37,
 38, 61, 62, 118, 120, 134, 135, 141,
 145, 159, 365, 366
 Thelander, M. 69
 Thompson, T. L. 106
 Thyen, H. 5, 34, 316
 Tidball, D. 12
 Tigchelaar, E. J. C. 105, 108, 220,
 224, 225, 226, 230, 232, 233, 234,
 236, 237, 344, 346, 349, 377
 Tov, E. 105, 108, 224, 236, 237
 Trocmé, E. 117
 Troeltsch, E. 2, 12, 13, 15, 24, 25,
 45, 46, 47, 54, 321
 Tronier, H. 99
 Turner, B. S. 29

 Ulfgard, H. 251, 278
 Ulrichsen, Jarl 150, 151, 159
 Umemoto, N. 322, 324, 325

 Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, F. 3, 8,
 76, 136, 137, 314, 319
 VanderKam, J. 106, 107, 110, 231
 Vermes, G. 105, 106, 107, 109, 112,
 187, 224, 228, 237
 Vos, C. S. de 39
 Vouga, F. 291, 303

 Wahlde, U. C. von 1, 291
 Wallis, R. 48, 54, 59, 61
 Walter, N. 88
 Watson, F. 13, 14, 37, 42
 Weber, K. 339
 Weber, M. 2, 12, 15, 24, 45, 46
 Wegner, U. 297, 298
 Weinfeld, M. 109, 110, 111,
 337–338, 350
 Wellhausen, J. 5
 Wendland, P. 98
 Wengst, K. 3, 34, 146
 Wenschkewitz, H. 120, 127, 220, 233
 Wentling, J. L. 219
 Wernberg-Møller, P. 110, 236, 237
 Whitaker, G. H. 97, 98, 375
 White, M. 52, 58
 Williamson, R. 94, 99, 102, 133,
 134, 190, 193, 197, 201, 202, 216,
 315, 322
 Wilson, B. 4, 10, 12, 14, 15, 20, 26,
 28, 46, 48–49, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55,
 59, 60, 62, 63, 357–360
 Winston, D. 204, 205, 322
 Wise, M. 224, 235
 Wolfson, H. A. 86, 90, 93, 99, 100,
 103, 190, 200, 202
 Woude, A. S. van der 106

 Yee, G. A. 124, 135, 136, 266, 276
 Yinger, M. J. 47, 54
 Yonge, C. D. 45
 Young, F. 35

 Zahn, T. 71
 Zeller, D. 102

TANAK/OLD TESTAMENT

Genesis		30:1	216
1	207	30:11–16	199, 232
1–17	213	34:22	273
2	207	40:34	167
2:2–3	257		
2:7	101, 206	Leviticus	
2:10	214	19:23–25	201
9:3	333	23	263
9:20	201	23:23–25	255
11:1–8	96	23:33–43	273
12ff	293	23:33ff	252
12:1–4	99	23:38	230
12:2	99	23:39	273
12:5	99	26:12	101
12:6	99, 293		
29:15	229	Numbers	
33:18–20	293	7:1–2	280
38:9	197	9	263
41:17–42	214	9:6–13	194
		9:9ff	198
Exodus		9:12	263, 271
8:26	327	11	266
11–20	267	15:24	238
12:6b	207	20:2–13	276
12:22	271	29:12	273
12:46	263, 271	32	332
15:1	102	35:28	215
15:17–18	346		
15:17b	235	Deuteronomy	
15:18	235	2:14	255
16	266	16:13	273
17:6	276	16:16	192
19:3	266	17:14ff	349
19:6	332	18:15–22	266
19:20	266	23:7	327
23:16	273	23:8	97
24:9–11	266	27:14ff	339
24:12–13	266	32:7–9	91
24:16	168	33:5	109
25–26	200		
25:7	168	Joshua	
25:8	168	5	263
25:10	200, 216		
27:1	216	Judges	
28	215	21:19	273
28:4	216		
28:15ff	215	1 Samuel	
		2:35	110–111

1 Kings		Jeremiah	
8:2	273	7:1–14	146
8:10–11	167	7:11	135
8:27–29	202	7:21ff	202
		13:17	307
1 Chronicle		23:2	307
12:18	109	23:2–3	310
24:7–18	231	50:28	123
		51:10–11	123
2 Chronicle		Ezekiel	
2:6	202	6:10	229
29–31	159	10:18–19	167
Ezra		11:22–23	167
9:1	325	34:11–12	307
		34:12	310
Nehemiah		34:31	307
8:14	273	37:12	310
		43:1–5	167
Esther	255	45:25	273
		Hosea	
Psalms		4:4–6	135
23	307	6:2	163
28:9	307	6:6	202, 237
68:8–9	307	6:6b	238
68:10	158		
69:5a	158	Joel	
69:10b	158	2:28	276
69:22a	158	3:1	276
69:22b	158		
74:1	307	Amos	
78:15–16	276	5:21–25	202
78:18–19	266	5:25–27	159
79:13	307		
95:7	307	Micah	
100:3	307	4:6–7	307
Proverbs		7:6–8	135
15:8	230	7:14	307
		Habakkuk	
Isaiah		2:17	227
1:11–15	202		
1:26–27	123	Zechariah	
19:5	229	10:3	307
40:10–11	307	14:8	276
40:11	307	14:16	166
42:6	289	14:20–21	135
43:5	310	14:20f	158
43:20	276	14:21	166
44:3–4	276		
48:21	276	Malachi	
49:9	307	1:10	229
56:7	135	3:1	135
60:14	123		
66:1	159, 202		
66:1ff	202		

NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew	14, 67, 85, 86, 129, 130, 136, 138, 145, 149, 173, 252, 259, 290, 297	11:11	148
		11:15–17	128, 144, 149
		11:15–19	148
		11:15ff	147, 149
3:7ff	129	11:16	144, 160
5:11	78	11:27	128, 149, 291
5:11–12	78	11:27–28	149
5:17	130	11:27–33	144
5:23–24	129, 130	11:27ff	129
5:34–35	128	11:28	149
6:22–23	78	11:57	128
8:5	297	12:1–8	257
8:8	297	12:41–44	130
8:10	297	14:1	271
8:12	297	14:12	271
8:15	297	14:22–25	151
10:5	293	14:57–58	144, 173
10:6	310	14:58	128, 145, 149, 164, 173, 174
10:32–33	77, 78		
12:1–18	257	15:29	144, 149
12:6	170, 172, 173	15:36	158
15:22	289	15:38	128, 130
15:24	289	15:42	271
15:28	290		
16:18	86	Luke	14, 25, 104, 129, 252
17:24–27	128, 129, 130	1:1ff	85
17:27	130	1:2	85
18:17	86	1:3	85
21:10–17	148	1:21–22	128
21:12–13	144, 147	2:32	289
21:23	149, 291	2:41ff	128
21:23–27	144	3:7ff	129
23:16–22	128	4:9	128
23:37–39	128	6:22	78
26:59–61	173	7:2	297
26:60–61	145	7:6	297
26:61	144, 149	12:8–9	77, 78
27:5–6	128	13:10–17	257
27:34	158	13:34–35	128
27:40	149	16:8	341
27:48	158	19:45–46	144, 148
28:18–20	290	19:45ff	147
		20:1	291
Mark	14, 145, 149, 252	20:1–8	144
2:23–28	257	20:2	149
6:39	263	22:1	271
8:33ff	77, 78	22:7	271

23:36	158	2:13-16	151, 160, 164
24:53	128, 129	2:13-17	144, 148, 151, 174, 176
John		2:13-22	123, 125, 129, 135, 143-176, 177, 184, 185, 246, 259, 263, 269, 279, 315, 369,
1:1-5	84		151, 155, 156, 157, 163, 178
1:1-18	31, 124	2:14	150, 153, 163, 177
1:4	288	2:14-16	150, 151, 156-160, 167
1:4-9	276	2:14-17	150, 155
1:5	74, 288		2:14a
1:7-9	288		2:14b
1:10	288	2:15	151, 156, 157
1:10a	288	2:16	135, 151, 157, 164, 166
1:11	294	2:16-17	163
1:12-13	50, 141, 311	2:16b	157, 158
1:14	72, 73, 128, 137, 168-169, 243	2:17	83, 150, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 163, 164, 166, 170
1:16	72	2:17-22	151, 152
1:17	168-169, 178, 258, 259, 263, 269	2:18	144, 149, 161
1:18	268	2:18-19	161
1:19	144	2:18-20	144, 153, 161, 176
1:19-12:50	124, 147, 253	2:18-21	150, 151
1:19-27	33	2:18-22	139, 150, 151, 161-167, 174
1:19-4:54	147	2:19	83, 144, 152, 159, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 167, 173, 174, 306
1:23-27	281	2:19-20	149
1:29	128, 144, 157, 165, 170, 263, 270, 272, 281	2:19-21	138, 139, 177
1:33	281	2:19-22	165, 180
1:34	281	2:20	83, 161, 163, 303
1:35-51	70	2:21	128, 137, 150, 151, 152, 153, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 176, 178, 184, 185, 206, 243, 246
1:35ff	144	2:21-22	150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 161, 162, 163
1:36	128, 170, 263, 270, 272	2:22	31, 74, 152, 162, 163, 166, 167, 258, 259, 269
1:39	83	2:23	153, 155, 161, 252, 261, 274, 287, 300
1:42	83	2:23-24	155
1:45	258, 267, 269, 283	3	17, 22, 80, 154, 155, 290, 294
1:47	137	3:2	124
1:50	83, 172	3:3	141, 154, 311
1:51	83, 124, 128, 170, 171		
2	29, 43, 63, 137, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 178, 179, 184, 246, 254, 260, 272, 273, 281, 282, 286		
2-4	124		
2:1-12	153, 154		
2:2	155		
2:6	153, 155, 178, 291		
2:10	154		
2:11	154		
2:12-22	152, 179		
2:13	147, 150, 153, 155, 156, 252, 261, 274		

3:3-5	165	4:20-21	123, 183
3:3-8	50	4:20-22	179
3:4	303	4:20-23	119, 184
3:5	4, 18, 183, 311	4:20-24	176, 177, 178, 184, 296
3:7	84, 141	4:21	83, 119, 166, 177, 179,
3:10	258, 259, 269		180, 181, 182, 183, 244,
3:11	72, 73, 286		282, 294, 295, 306
3:12	83	4:21-22	183
3:16	288, 317	4:21-23	278, 282, 294
3:16-17	288, 319	4:21-24	172
3:19	276, 288	4:22	181, 182, 183, 293, 295,
3:19-21	294		296
3:20	288	4:23	32, 83, 119, 158, 170,
3:21	288		180, 182, 184, 294, 295
3:24	114	4:23-24	164, 173, 179, 182, 183,
3:29	21		244, 246, 296
3:35	288	4:24	179, 182, 242
4	43, 63, 124, 125, 137,	4:25	83
	138, 152, 168, 176, 177,	4:25-26	295
	178, 179, 183, 184, 185,	4:26	295
	243, 246, 247, 260, 272,	4:27-38	177
	273, 281, 282, 286, 287,	4:28	292
	290, 295, 296, 299, 301,	4:31-34	165, 303
	306, 316	4:34-38	177
4:1-19	177	4:35	255
4:1-2	177	4:38	72
4:1-42	176, 177, 178, 179, 183,	4:38b	308
	185, 290, 295, 317	4:39	295
4:1-6	177	4:39-42	177
4:2	114	4:40	293
4:3-6	177	4:41-42	295
4:5	293	4:42	177, 181, 287, 288, 293,
4:7	291, 296		294, 296, 300
4:7-15	177, 180	4:43	299
4:9	291, 292, 296, 313	4:43-45	299, 300
4:9a	296	4:43-54	262, 317
4:9b	291, 296	4:45	156, 253, 299, 300
4:10-11	128	4:45ff	299
4:10-14	274	4:46	291, 299, 301
4:10-15	165, 276	4:46-47	296
4:11	292	4:46-53	298
4:11-14	294	4:46-54	299
4:11ff	303	4:46ff	144
4:12	172, 180, 293	4:48	299, 300, 301
4:13	83	4:49	297
4:14	181, 276	4:50	300, 301
4:14a	180, 294	4:53	301, 302
4:14b	180	4:53b	300
4:14ff	180	5	29, 114, 151, 252,
4:15	277		254, 255, 256, 257,
4:16-26	176, 177, 180		258, 259, 262, 270, 281,
4:19	181		286
4:19ff	140	5-10	124, 253, 280
4:20	119, 181, 292, 296	5-8	255

5:1	123, 128, 252, 253, 254, 255, 259, 262	6:4	155, 252, 253, 261, 263, 266
5:1a	254	6:5-13	266
5:1b	254	6:10	263
5:1-9	256	6:14	266, 288
5:1-17	257	6:16	260
5:1-18	257	6:16-22	261
5:1-47	262	6:16ff	144
5:5	255	6:17	261, 288
5:9	252, 256	6:21	261
5:9b	256	6:22	260
5:10	252	6:22-59	261, 262
5:10-18	256	6:24	261
5:14	123, 252, 254, 256, 274	6:25	261, 266
5:16	252, 256, 287	6:25-58	261
5:16-47	33	6:25-59	265, 267
5:17	258	6:25ff	267
5:18	252, 256	6:27	83, 265, 267
5:19	256, 317	6:28	261
5:19-23	256	6:28-29	258
5:20	172, 288	6:28-59	261
5:22	255	6:30	261
5:24	255	6:31	265, 267
5:25	83, 182	6:32	265, 267
5:27	255	6:32-35	165, 263, 266
5:28f	83	6:32ff	265, 303
5:29	255	6:33	267
5:30	255	6:34	261
5:35	276, 288	6:35	83, 265, 274, 303
5:36	172	6:41	291
5:37	269	6:41-42	165
5:37-38	256, 268	6:42	265
5:37-40	257	6:46	268, 269
5:38-39	270	6:47	267
5:39	252, 256, 257, 259, 269, 369	6:48	267
5:42	288	6:49	265, 267
5:43	83	6:49-50	265, 267
5:45	83, 269	6:51	141, 264, 267, 288
5:45-46	269	6:51-53	165
5:46	256, 257, 267, 269, 270, 283	6:51-58	303
5:47	83	6:51c-58	4
5:53-58	268	6:52	291
6	80, 114, 123, 151, 252, 255, 259, 260-264, 266, 268, 270, 273, 281, 282, 315	6:54	83, 268
6:1	260	6:55	265, 267
6:1ff	144	6:58	265, 267
6:1-16	261	6:59	260, 261, 263, 315
6:1-59	262	6:60-65	261
6:3	266	6:60ff	81
		6:62	139
		6:64	83
		6:66	260
		6:67-71	261
		6:68-69	81
		6:69	280

7	29, 123, 252, 272, 279, 282, 286, 302, 303, 304, 306	8:31	314
7-8	252	8:31-33	165
7:1	262, 291, 302	8:31-59	319
7:1-11	128	8:36ff	303
7:1-13	274	8:42	288
7:2	155, 252, 273, 274	8:42-47	50
7:7	288	8:44	137, 314
7:8	274	8:44ff	294
7:10-11	274	8:51-53	165
7:14	123, 140, 252, 274, 275, 306, 315	8:51ff	303
7:14-36	274	8:53	172
7:14ff	125	8:56-58	165
7:15-24	262	8:59	121, 123, 140, 160, 252, 274, 275, 294
7:19	258	9	75, 252, 262, 294, 315
7:21-23	257	9:1-41	257
7:22-23	252, 257, 258	9:4	124, 286
7:23ff	305	9:5	276, 288
7:28	123, 252, 274, 275, 302, 315	9:14	252
7:33-36	165	9:16	252
7:34	303	9:18	79
7:35	83, 287, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 317	9:22	17, 31, 33, 76, 77, 122, 138, 156, 312, 314, 317, 367, 370
7:35-36	303, 304	9:38	177
7:36	303	9:39	295
7:37	252, 274, 282	9:40	307
7:37-39	274	10	123, 282, 286, 307, 309
7:37-44	276-277	10:1	308
7:37-8:20	274	10:1-16	4
7:37b-38	276	10:1-21	81
7:37ff	277	10:2-42	125
7:38	128, 170, 273	10:5	83
7:39	82, 276	10:8	307, 308
7:41	291	10:9	83
7:50	124	10:10	307, 308
7:53-8:11	123	10:11	307, 309
8	123, 314	10:12	308, 309
8:2	123, 274, 306, 312, 315	10:13	308
8:12	83, 273, 274, 276, 277, 288	10:15	309
8:12-20	277-278	10:16	80, 83, 137, 287, 307, 309, 311
8:13	278	10:17	288
8:13-20	262	10:18	169
8:15	258	10:19	307
8:17	310	10:20	3
8:20	123, 252, 274, 275, 303, 306, 315	10:22	274, 279
8:21-22	165	10:22-39	278
8:21ff	303, 304	10:22a	279
8:23	50, 303, 304	10:22ff	252
8:23-24	139	10:23	123, 275, 279
		10:30	280
		10:33	280
		10:35	269

10:36	279, 280	13:10	270
10:39	279	13:10–17	257
10:41–42	281	13:12ff	80
10:42	287	13:15	81
11	123, 260, 272, 286, 296, 309	13:16	81, 172
11–19	260	13:18	269
11ff	252	13:20	286
11:1–44	78	13:21	83
11:9	276	13:23	71
11:10	124	13:26	83
11:11	21	13:30	124
11:12	83	13:33	80, 83, 303
11:25	180	13:34	79, 288
11:46	148	13:34–35	288
11:48	83, 119, 166, 296	13:35	83, 288
11:49–50	310	13:36	303
11:49ff	74	13:38	83
11:50	81, 309, 312	14–17	83
11:50–51	311	14:2	124
11:51–52	83, 310, 311, 314	14:2ff	303
11:51b–52	312	14:3	83
11:52	137, 287, 309, 310, 317	14:10	178, 242
11:55	155, 252, 270–273	14:12	74, 83
11:55b	270	14:13	83
11:55ff	264	14:15	288
11:56	121, 123, 275	14:15–17	3
12	148, 288, 302	14:16–17	83
12:1	252, 270, 305	14:17	50, 82, 288
12:11	78	14:18–19	83
12:12	270	14:19	50
12:16	74	14:21	288
12:19	288, 305	14:25–26	3
12:20	177, 302, 304, 305, 306, 317	14:26	82, 83
12:20ff	305	14:27	288
12:23–36	141	14:30	50, 288
12:25	288	15	50
12:25f	83	15:1–6	4
12:32	162, 305	15:1ff	81
12:35	276, 288	15:12	288
12:36	341	15:13	288
12:37–41	269	15:14	80
12:42	17, 33, 76, 122, 156, 312, 314, 317, 367, 370	15:14–15	21
12:46	276, 288, 305	15:18	288
13	80	15:18–19	288
13–17	70, 79, 83	15:19	50, 288
13–19	123, 260, 270–273	15:20	172
13:1	252, 264, 270, 288	15:23–25	288
13:1–17:26	124	15:25	158
13:1–2	272	15:26	82, 83
13:1–20	80, 372	15:26–27	3
13:7	83	15:4–8	170
		15:5–6	81
		15:9–10	288
		16:2	17, 33, 76, 83, 122,

	156, 312, 314, 317, 367, 370	19:26	71
16:2-3	83	19:28-30	158
16:3	23	19:29	271
16:5-11	3	19:31	252, 264
16:7	82	19:33	271, 272
16:7-8	83	19:33-37	264
16:8-11	50	19:34	170, 271, 277
16:11	288	19:34b-35	4
16:12-15	3	19:35	71
16:13	82	19:35b	71
16:14	83	19:36	269
16:16ff	303	19:36-37	264
16:20	83, 288	19:38	33, 264
16:23-24	83	19:39	124
16:27	288	19:40	264
16:32	182	20	252
16:33	50, 288	20-21	167
17	68, 288	20:1	252, 288
17:5	288	20:2-3	71
17:6	288	20:8	71
17:9	288	20:11-18	167
17:11	79	20:12	264
17:13-17	288	20:17	167
17:14	288, 289, 369	20:19	33, 167, 252
17:14-19	50	20:19-23	286
17:15	288, 289, 369, 370	20:22	82
17:16	288, 289	20:25-29	301
17:18	81, 289, 369	20:26	167
17:20	81	20:27	164
17:20-21	366	20:29	81, 300
17:21	311	20:30-31	34, 71
17:21b-23	289	20:31	33, 72, 85
17:25	288	20:31-32	31
17:26	288	21	3, 31, 71, 114, 167
18	264, 296	21:3	124
18-19	36, 144, 286	21:7	71
18:1-20:31	124	21:15ff	288
18:9	114	21:20	71
18:14	312	21:23	71, 80
18:15-16	71	21:24	72, 73
18:20	123, 160, 169, 288, 306, 315	21:24-25	71, 85
18:28	252, 270, 287	21:24a	71
18:28b	264, 271	21:24b	71
18:31-34	241	21:25	71
18:32	114	22:1-25	124
18:36	288	Acts	45, 129, 131, 132, 133, 144, 148, 273, 302, 306
18:39	252, 270	1-11	154
19	252, 264, 296	2:46	132
19:14	252, 270	4:1-3	133
19:23	280	4:5-7	133
19:23-25	280	4:12	133
19:24	269	5:15-16	133

5:27–28	133	Galatians	
5:33	133	2:3	302
5:42	132	6:11	70
5:42b	132		
6–7	133	Ephesians	
6:13–14	173	2:11	133
6:14	144, 149	2:19–21	162
7	133, 174, 202–203	2:21	131, 174
7:48 (ff)	133, 136, 202	3:28	290
7:49	159	4:12	162, 174
8:27	305	5:8	341
10	305		
11:20	290	1 Thessalonians	
12:20–21	297, 298	5:5	341
15:5	45		
17:4	302	1 Timothy	
17:24	133	3:15	131
18–19	75		
21:17–26	136	Hebrews	129, 133, 134, 135,
21:26–30	131		193, 220
21:37	302	3–4	135
21:37–39	325	3:6	131
22:17	131	8:13	133
24:5	45	8:5	134, 136
24:14	45	8:8–12	135
24:18	131	9:6ff	133
25:8	131	9:8–10	134
26:5	45	9:10	134
26:21	131	9:11	133
28:22	45	9:11–12	162
		9:12	134
1 Corinthians	14, 49, 131, 178	9:15	133
1:24	290	9:23 (ff)	134
3:16	162, 174, 242	9:24	133
3:16–17	131, 132	9:25	134
5:7	271, 272	10:3	134
6:19	131, 132, 162, 209,	10:23–25	134
	42	11:1–12:2	135
10:16	151	13:13–15	134
10:17	151		
10:21	151	Titus	
10:3–4	151	1:12	313
11:23–25	271, 272		
11:23–29	151	James	
12:12–27	170	2:8	297, 298
12:27	174		
2 Corinthians		1 Peter	14, 190, 220
3:17	182	1:1	304
5:1	162	2:5	162, 182
6:16	131, 174	2:15	131
6:19	132	3:18	131
		4:17	131, 162

1 John 20, 114, 223
 1:7 272
 2:2 121, 272
 2:18ff 2
 4:10 121

2 John 73, 84
 1 85
 4 85
 7ff 2
 13 85

3 John 18, 73, 85
 1 85
 3 85
 6 85
 9 85

9ff 2
 10 85

Revelation 1, 2, 220
 1:14 302
 3:12 131
 3:25 121
 6:10 131
 8:15–16 183
 9–11 137
 10:9 78
 11:19 162
 12:1 132, 182
 12:5 170
 15:3 158
 15:16 254
 21:22 131, 162, 172

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA

Abr.	87	187	90
56–57	331	190	95, 98, 102, 105
92	326		
99	105	Congr.	
107	323, 326	20–21	326
167ff	329	23	90
182	330	41	323
184	329	49	326
233	194	74	88
251	325	83–85	326
260	324	89	194
		98	90
Agr.		Contempl.	86, 94, 95, 219, 247
62	326	8–9	327
88–89	326	29	45
157	96	31	262
		58ff	324
Cher.		68	324
39	90	75	262
52	194	75–78	261
86	101	75ff	262
91	324		
91ff	324, 330	Decal.	87
94	200, 201	7	194
97	331	32	333
97–106	209	64	328
98–101	245	76	201
99–100	209	76ff	326–327
100	194		
101	209	Det.	
Conf.		20	194
1	96	21	203, 216
2	95, 96, 98,	63	194
2–13	96	125	324
4	97	160	194
6	324		
12	97	Deus	
13	97	8	101
14	96, 97, 98	16–19	197
15	96	17	99
18	99	17–18	197
70	326	21	322
78	196	61–64	89
134–135	326	141	322
144	90	173	323
155–156	98	174	323

Ebr.		112	194
1	322	123	208
3	90	182	200
33-92	93	197	90
84	99	248	90
85	194, 200		
87	216	Hypoth.	
95	326, 327	6:6	194
101	102, 242	7:13	262
110	323, 326		
127	194	Ios.	87
		2	90
Flacc.	88, 313, 323, 330		
17	326	Leg. 1	
29	326	18	257
40	323	46	90
41ff	330	58	323
45-46	198	62	192
46	194, 196	108	102
48ff	330		
74	89	Leg. 2	
77	89	54	194
80	89	59	102, 323
92	194	103	102, 326
96	323		
		Leg. 3	
Fug.		8	326
8	326	11	192
18	327	46	194
61	90	47	103
90	194	69	102
93	194	95	194
94	194, 196	178	90
108	215		
114	326	Legat.	
147-148	326	62	194
180	326	132ff	330
186	194	139	194
		150	194
Gig.		151	194
1	90	155-156	195
15	322	156	97, 193, 199
54	194	166	94
58-60	324	178	94
		188	97, 197
Her.		188-190	218
23	90	189	200
69	101	189-190	197
71	101	191	194, 315
74	208	203	196
75	208, 209	209	197
75-76	127	214	198
76	245	216	199
89	90	225	196

233	194	318	194
278	194	319–333	332
281	196, 197	320	332
281–283	198	324	332
282	196		
288	196	Mos. 2	
292	194	12	324
294	196	12ff	329
295	194	14	329
299	196	17	333
305	196	20–25	333
306	193	44	332
312	199	67ff	191, 210, 217
319	194	72	194, 196
334	196	88	334
346	194, 196	89	194
		98–99	90
Migr.	98	107–108	194
1–126	99	138	194
5	194	141	194
16	322	159	194
86	104	161–162	327
86–91	257	174	194
86–93	95, 98, 99, 212	178	194
86–105	99	186 (ff)	331, 332
88	99	189	334
88–89	99	193ff	327
88–90	100	194–195	327
89–93	195, 245	232	194, 198, 217
90	100, 103		
91	100, 101	Mut.	
92	101	43	194
93	101, 102, 103, 104, 206, 212	45	99
		61	97
94–105	104	163	90
124	90	190	194
127	102	205	326
127–175	99		
151	326	Opif.	87, 207
178	323, 326	8	242
202	194, 326	30	90
		34	207
Mos. 1	87	128	91
1	313	134	101
4	91	136	206
47	323	136–137	206, 242
149	331	137	131, 162, 194, 242
201	334	140	207
234	198	157	324
277	194	170–172	326
278	332		
309	194	Plant.	
316	194	14	329
317	194	18	322

50	194	Sacr.	
73	201	10	90
93–139	201	51	326
108	194	72	194
117–125	201	84	211
117–139	201	111	211
126	201, 202, 217, 245	130	326, 327
126–127	202		
145	90	Sobr.	
		17	90
Post.		44	96
2	326	66	331
5	194		
28	90	Somn. 1–2	213
39	322		
89–90	91	Somn. 1	213
124	90	14	242
158	327	37	90
165	327	39	89
		41	196
Praem.	87	72	91
94–97	196	85	194
123	101, 194, 208, 209	121	88
139	194	148–149	101
165	198	149	209
168	196	181	196
		172	90
Prob.		215	208
73ff	330	233	90
74	330	236–237	90
75	221		
89	194	Somn. 2	213
93ff	330	27	90
		56	323, 330
Prov.		82	90
2:64	195, 199, 218, 323	109	326
		198	90
QE	261, 262	215–302	214
1:10	207, 326, 332	216–217	214
2:51	209	237	214
2:107	215	242	90
2:107–124	215	246	194, 214
2:110–117	215	248	101, 209, 215
2:115	215	250	203, 205, 213, 214, 245
		272	194
QG	261, 262		
1:36	326	Spec. 1–4	87, 210
2:58	333		
3:42	334	Spec. 1	211
4:177	326	2	216, 327
		21	194
QG isf		21ff	200
17	194	45–49	100
		65	211

66	194, 211	120	194
66–67	217	163	207, 208
66–78	211	163–164	331
66ff	191, 194, 210–212	164	331
67	194, 195, 210, 211	165	324, 331, 335
68	104, 198, 211, 212	204	194
68–69	198	204–214	273
68b–69	195		
69	211	Spec. 3	210
71ff	200	16	206
72	194, 200	22–23	326, 329
76–78	97, 199	53	196
77	199	89	194
77–78	218	130	196
78	199, 217	131–136	216
79–130	211		
84–97	208, 245	Spec. 4	210
123	194	61	91
133	333	179	332
152	211	181	333
156	194		
161	216	Virt.	87, 211
186	195	34	330
208	334	51–74	322
268	194	64	331, 333
270	194	65	331
274	194	106–108	327
280	91	108	97, 327
312	329	188	194, 208
316	332	211	328
319ff	200	211–220	328
328	91	212	328
		212ff	326
Spec. 1–2	210	219	328
		221	326
Spec. 2			
41	194		

QUMRAN LITERATURE

(cf. Martínez and Tigchelaar 1998:1313ff)

1QH (Hodayot)	108, 222	1:9–10	341
14:8	339	1:10	111
20:4–9	231	1:11	341
		1:12	338
1QM (War Scroll)	108, 109, 222, 341, 347, 350	1:13–15	231
		1:16	339, 341
1:1	111	1:21–23	345
1,1:8bff	348	1:22	342
12:11	347	1:23	342
13:8	339	1:24ff	343
14:7	347	2:2–3	338
17:8	339	2:4–5	339
		2:11–17	339, 341
		2:16	339, 341
1QMyst (Mysteries)	348	2:19ff	345
1:8–12 (1QMyst27)	349	2:22	342
		2:25–3:6	339
1QpHab		3:2	109
(Pesher to Habakkuk)	108, 224, 241	3:3	341
		3:13 (ff)	111, 341, 343
2:3	339	3:17	343
12:7b–10a	227	3:17b–4:1	111
		3:18	343
1QS (Rule of the Community)	10, 11, 80, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 115, 116, 219, 224, 225, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 247, 248, 338–341, 341–344, 345, 346, 350, 362	3:20–21	342
		3:24	342
		4:2	343
		4:9	340
		4:9–11	340
		4:11	342
		4:15–16	343
		4:22	342
		4:25	342
		5:1	338, 341
		5:1b–2a	342
		5:1–2	109, 110, 338, 342
		5:4	339
		5:4ff	233
		5:5	234
		5:5–6	342
		5:6	341
		5:8	341
1–4	341	5:10	341, 342
1:7	341	5:18	337, 342
1:8–9	231	5:19	342

5:20	341	10	341
5:21	341	10:2	342
5:22	341	10:19	340
5:23	337	10:20	340
5:24	341	10:20-21	340
6-9	340	10:21	342
6:1b-2	111	11:2b	111
6:1ff	339	11:7	342
6:3	162	11:8	233, 338
6:3-4a	339-340	11:9 (ff)	343
6:7	338	11:10	343
6:8	338	11:14-15	343
6:9	338	11:16	342
6:13	341, 343	11:17	339
6:13-14	345	13-14	231
6:13b-23a	110, 111		
6:14	337	1QS _a (Rule of	
6:16	337, 341	the Congregation)	108
6:18ff	337	1Q28 _a	108
6:24ff	340	1:1	338, 345
6:25	339	2:3-11	222
6:26	339		
7:1	340	1Q32 (1QJN ar)	
7:3	339, 340	1QNew Jerusalem ar	225
7:5	339		
7:18	339	2Q24 (2QJN ar)	
7:24-26	340	2QNew Jerusalem	225
7:24ff	340		
8:1-16	222, 228	4Q	336
8:4	343		
8:4b-7a	233	4QD	221, 229
8:4ff	233	3:3	229
8:5	234		
8:11	342	4QD a, b	229
8:12	343		
8:13	228, 342	4QFlor (4Q174)	
8:14	234	4QFlorilegum	234, 235, 349
8:21b-23a	340	1, 1:2:6a-7b	234
8:24	339	1, 1:2ff	349
8:25-26	340	1, 1:3-4	346, 349
9	237	1, 1:4	347
9-10	111	1, 1:6	162
9:3	343	1:1-7a	235
9:3-5	222	2	235
9:3-6	109	3	235
9:3ff	233, 235-239	6a	235
9:4	236, 237, 238	6b	235
9:5(b)-6	342		
9:6	343	4Q159 (4Qord a)	
9:8	340	4QOrdinances a	232
9:13	234	1, 2, 6-9	231
9:21b-22a	340		
9:22	340		
9:26-10:8	231		

4Q169 (4QpNah)		6QD (Damascus Document)	221
4QNahum Pesher	348		
3-4, 2:8-9	348		
4Q186		11Q18 (11QNJ ar)	225
(4QHoroscope)	344	11QNew Jerusalem	
4Q258 (4QS d) 4QRule of the Community		11QT (Temple)	108, 346, 349
2, 2:4b-5	237	29:9-10	235
5	237	40:5	349
4Q394 (4QMMT a) 4QHalakhic Letter a		48:11-12	346
3-7, 1	230	57:15b-17	346
8, 2:10-12	112	56:14-15	349
4Q394-399 (4QMMT a) 4QHalakhic Letter a-f	108, 110, 111, 222, 229, 230, 231, 346, 350	CD (Cairo Damascus)	108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 221, 222, 224, 225, 227, 228, 229, 240, 241, 350
4Q398 (4QMMT a) 4QHalakhic Letter e		1:3ff	225, 226, 227
11-13	230	1:4	339
6-7	230	1:4a	227
4Q501 (4QapocrLam B) 4QApocryphal Lamentations B	349	3:19	110
4Qord (Ordinances)		4:2	345
2-4:2	346	4:12b	227
2:1-2	349	4:17	226
4Q513 (4Qordinances b)	231, 346, 349	5:6	226
1-2	349	6	230
4Q554-555 (4QNJ a ar) 4QNew Jerusalem a-b	225	6:11	229
4Q561 (4QHor ar) 4QPhysiognomy/Horoscope ar	344	6:11-12	222
5Q15 (Lamentations)	225	6:11b-14a	229
5QD (Damascus Document)	221	6:12b-14a	229
		6:13	229
		6:14a-15a	110
		6:19	339
		6:21	348
		7:6	112
		8:17	339
		8:21	339
		9-16	225
		9:13-14	228
		9:14	228
		11:12	346
		11:14	346
		11:14-23	227
		11:14b-15	346
		11:17-18	228, 230
		11:17-21	229
		11:17b-21	230
		11:18	230
		11:18-21	230
		11:18b-19	227
		11:21	230

12:1-2	228	20:9	226
12:3-6	231	20:10	226
12:6	348	20:12	339
12:6b	347	20:21	226
12:8b-9	347	20:22	226
12:19	111	20:22-23	220, 227
14:3-6	347	20:22b-24	226
14:3ff	347	20:22f	225
14:4	348	20:23	226
14:6	348		
16:1ff	228	CD-A (Cairo	
16:2-4	231	Damsacus)	108
16:6ff	228		
19:33b	339	CD-B (Cairo	
20	220	Damsacus)	108, 220

JOSEPHUS

Antiq.		2:10	155
2:118	293	2:52	298
3:123	210	2:55	298
3:179–187	210	2:58	298
3:179ff	215	2:119	347
4:200	210	2:162	45
8:123	273	2:220	88
12:10	118	2:239	293
12:235	279	2:261–263	325
12:387–388	118	2:309	88
13:65–70	118	2:409–410	118
13:74–79	93	3:307–315	118
13:254–258	118	4:140–141	297
15:50	273	5:145	112
15:248	118	5:205	88
18:19	221	5:212–213	210
18:159–160	88	5:474	297
18:259	88	6:288ff	135
18:261	197	7:42ff	118
18:310–313	199	7:45	302
19:276	88	7:105	297
19:279–291	88		
19:280–285	89	Contra Ap.	88
20:169–172	325	2:193	210
Bell.		Vita	
1:33	118	10	45
1:45	298	269	293
1:62	118	400	298
1:78	221	402	298

VARIA

b. Ber. 28a	75	1 Enoch	
28b–29a	75	72–82	231
b. Git. 56a	135	Aeschylus	
m. Ber. 7:1	292	Prometheus 869	297
9:5	157	Plato	
m. Nid. 4:1	291, 292	Leges	10:909d
m. Sukkah		212	10:910a
4:9	276	212	869b
5:3	277	101	
t. Sabb. 15:16	257	Politicus	279a 297
t. Sukkah 3:16–17	276	Symposium	
Midrash Rabbah		216d–217a	101
Gen. Rab. 30:6	257	Phaedo	
Lam. Rab.		64c	101
135	1:5	Parmenides	130ff
120	1:17–19a	103	133a–b
Mek. on Exod	261	103	
2 Baruch	120	Papyrus Oxxyrhynchus	
4 Ezra	120	3:513	298
1 Maccabees		Plutarch Solon 27	297
4:41–61	279	Eusebius	
		Historia Ecclesiastica	
		3:23:3–4	73
		Praeparatio	
		Evangelica 8:14	195
		Irenaeus	
		Adversus Haereses	
		2:22:5	73
		3:3:4	73